THE

LEADING IDEAS OF THE GOSPELS

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE GOSPELS

BY

WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D.,
D.C.L. OXON, LL.D. DUBLIN

HEADFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH, AND PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND

Circa thema generalis
Habet quisque speciale
Syll-prologium.
ADAM DE S. VICTOR. *Cc. De SS. Evangelistis*

ἡ πόλις τετράγωνος κεῖται.
Apoc. xxi. 16

THIRD EDITION

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1898

First Edition printed 1879. Second Edition, 1890. Third Edition, 1898.

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON & BUNGAY.

Dedication.

TO

MY SON AND DAUGHTER-IN-LAW

CECIL JOHN FRANCIS AND EVA MACMURROUGH ALEXANDER

UNDER WHOSE HAPPY ROOF AT ARRAGHSLEA

THIS WORK

IN ITS PRESENT FORM

WAS BEGUN :—

TO

MY BROTHER-IN-LAW AND SISTER

MAXIMILIAN HAMMOND AND MATILDA DALISON

IN WHOSE DELIGHTFUL HOME

AT HAMPTONS

IT WAS FINISHED.

His quadrigis deportatur
Mundo Deus, sublimatur
  Istis arca vectibus;
Paradisi haec fluenta
Nova pluunt sacramenta
  Quae irrorant gentibus.

Non est domus ruitura
Hâc subnixa quadraturâ,
  Haec est domus Domini;
Gloriemur in hâc domo,
Quâ beatè vivit homo
  Deo junctus homini.
  Amen.

ADAM DE S. VICT. "*De SS. Evangeliis.*" CI.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION

THIS volume, in its present shape, is rather a new book than a new edition.

The germ from which it grew was originally presented to the public in some sermons delivered before the University of Oxford in 1870-71 by the author as Select Preacher. The conception which linked the series of discourses together was not, at the time, very familiar to English readers; and the volume appeared to excite a certain degree of interest.

It has now been out of print for a few years. As the writer hears that it is still asked for, he gladly avails himself of an opportunity to amend, recast, and enlarge it.

Such correction and amplification was greatly needed for several reasons.

1. The original book was necessarily put together in some haste. The author felt that he had laid hold of a sound conception, fruitful in application

to the true exposition of the Gospels; but he had not leisure at the time to follow it out with sufficient fulness—nor, indeed, do sermons for oral delivery readily admit of much detail. For many years, however, he has constantly kept the Leading Ideas of the evangelists in view in his study of the Gospels, and applied them to several passages which had escaped, not only his own first investigations, but, as far as he knows, the observation of critics generally. In short, he has laboured to teach himself, and hopes that he may, therefore, succeed in teaching some others.

2. Moreover, the writer cannot conceal from himself that there were faults in the *tone* of his little volume of sermons. They were not only too *sermonizing* for a subject which required *didactic* treatment, but even the *sermonizing* (true, as he believes, in itself) was set on a wrong key and thrust into a wrong place.

The overthrow of the Irish Establishment had affected the preacher of the sermons deeply. It tinged all objects around him with a certain strong and lurid light. The subsequent admission of the laity, not only to a co-ordinate part in general ecclesiastical legislation (to which he was always favourable), but to the right even of initiative in solemn doctrinal questions, filled

him with forebodings. The crash of the revolution from without was followed by the rumbling of an explosion from within. He thought it right to sound an alarm as loudly as he could; and his voice was, perhaps, not quite unheard.

But as the author, become his own critic, went over his volume when he could look back upon it as something remote and almost external to himself, his pencil ran through all passages of the kind. Not only are polemics a growth which does not flourish in the frigid air of age; not only is the controversial epigram which pleased us in middle life a thing in which we find cause for repentance as we move onward from the din of the strife towards the silence of eternity—temporary controversies, however important in their own place, are better absent from our dealings with those immortal pages where Christ is all and in all. In the Gospels He is in His holy temple. We should keep silence before Him. To read their meaning should be our only object.

The writer has provided an "Occam's razor"[1] for himself by the simple expedient of abolishing the hortatory form of the sermon. The calmer and more progressive method of a regular didactic treatise enables him (he hopes) to do more justice

[1] "Entia non multiplicanda esse praeter necessitatem."

to a theory which throws light upon the one four-fold record of the Person and work of the Incarnate Lord.

3. In addition to *revision* of the original matter, several important *additions* have been made. (*a*) The conception of Leading Ideas in the Gospels has been carefully guarded, and discriminated from the extravagant application of it which might make the evangelists appear to be romantic ideologists. (*b*) The study of St. Luke's Gospel has been specially enlarged, and a principle of division adopted (from the circumstances of his life; from his special training; from his natural endowments) which seems suited for dealing with his Leading Ideas. The subject of St. Luke's alleged Ebionitism has also been carefully examined. (*c*) The most sacred portion of a narrative where all is sacred—the record of the Passion—has been elucidated by the Leading Ideas of the evangelists. (*d*) A synopsis has been prefixed, and an index appended.[1]

[1] Indexes were at one time *profined* to many English books. The advantage of this plan did not escape Shakespeare. His pieces his observations upon it (curiously out of place chronologically and in place psychologically) in the mouth of *Nestor*.

. . . In such indexes, although small pricks
To their subsequent volumes, there is seen
The *baby figure of the giant mass*
Of things to come at large.
Troilus and Cressida. (Act i. Sc. iii.)

It is believed that very much of the four Gospels will thus receive more or less expository light.

It only remains to say that the writer has largely worked up his materials for himself. Indeed (with one important exception) he scarcely knew where to look for much assistance. But there are three works to which he must express distinct obligations. The first is the beautiful book of Lange,[1] to which his debt is considerable. The second is Riggenbach's *Life of the Lord Jesus* in his useful remarks upon the "end and plan" of the evangelists.[2] The third, and in some respects most valuable, is the first volume of the New Testament, by the late holy and learned Bishop of Lincoln, and especially the Prefaces to the Gospels (above all that to St. Luke) with their stores of patristic learning and saintly insight.

[1] "*The Life of Christ*, by J. P. Lange, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn." Four volumes (English translation. T. and T. Clark). The fourth volume is, indeed, a treatise on the four gospels as symbolized by the ox, lion, man, and eagle. Those who are fond of such pursuits can easily track the present writer in the snow of Lange, by comparing his discussions on the Leading Ideas of the narrative of the Passion with Lange. *Life of Christ*, vol. iv. 98, 130, 175, 183, 300, 308, 451; also vol. ii. 101, 310.

[2] "*Vie de Seigneur Jésus*. Leçons Publiques, par D. J. Riggenbach, Professeur de Théologie, Bâle. Traduit de l'Allemand, par G. Steinhill." pp. 1–89.

The author's acknowledgments are due to the Rev. W. K. Hobart, LL.D., for a remarkable list of medical words in the Epistle to the Hebrews. A young theologian of promise, Mr. J. T. S. Stopford, B.A., T.C.D., has assisted him in carrying his work through the Press, and supplied a useful Index.

May this book be of service to students of the Gospels, and aid some souls to know Christ a little better.

WILLIAM DERRY AND RAPHOE.

HAMPTONNE, TONBRIDGE,
August 8, 1891.

PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

THE present edition has been carefully revised and corrected. A few additions of some importance have been introduced.

WILLIAM ARMAGH.

April 7, 1898.

CONTENTS

I

SUBJECT—THE GOSPELS ARE PERVADED BY LEADING IDEAS

III

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

I

II

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

A

From the Circumstances of his Life

CONTENTS

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

E

THE DANGER OF RICHES AND THE COMPENSATIONS OF POVERTY

Starting-point from the incident (xvii. 18-31).

[1] Observe the qualification in the note, p. 184.

See *infra* B, n. 1.

II

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

A.—ST. MATTHEW

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

B.—ST. MARK

I

II

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

C.—ST. LUKE

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

D.—St. John

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE GOSPELS

I

THERE ARE LEADING IDEAS OF THE GOSPELS

"As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man, and the face of a lion, on the right side; and they four had the face of an ox on the left side; they four also had the face of an eagle."—EZEKIEL i. 10.

1

VIEWED from their human and literary side, the Gospels may be defined as informal memoirs of the earthly life of our Lord Jesus Christ—written from, and pervaded by, certain great Leading Ideas. Indeed, a consideration of their character and purpose will show that no other conception is tenable.

For there are two things which the Gospels assuredly are *not*.

(*a*) They are as far as possible from being regular biographies in the modern sense. They have neither consecutive fulness of detail, nor

complete chronological exactitude. What is very important, they make no attempt at developing the gradual evolution of a lofty thought and career. Indeed they *could* not do this—the most interesting part of a great man's life—without coming into conflict with the central dogma which renders Christ's earthly career the most important part of the history of the human race. From hence it follows that to demand absolute completeness from an evangelist, is to misunderstand the very nature and condition of his work.

One important corollary follows from this.

We have no right to charge any evangelist with ignorance of a fact, however important, because he may happen not to mention it articulately. Thus we are not warranted in asserting that St. John "knew nothing of the birth in Bethlehem,"[1] or that the synoptics were unacquainted with the resurrection of Lazarus, because St. John does not distinctly record the one event, or because the three do not appear to refer to the other. The objection comes from critics who have forgotten, or who never possessed the very definition of a Gospel. He who has no right to the premiss—"an evangelist is to be put out of court who does not record *every* important event"—has no right to its conclusion.

[1] To those who know the method of St. John's *irony*, stating, as proof positive the very objection which to adversaries seemed fatal, the passage St. John viii. 41, 42, will be decisive upon this point.

(*b*) If the Gospels are not, on the one hand, regular biographies, neither, on the other hand, are they mere collections of pious anecdotes or great sayings, strung together at random.[1]

There was lodged in the memory of the original Apostles and disciples a treasury of recollections. The works, the discourses, the Personality of Jesus Christ, were there in abundant fulness. As time passed, and a written record of those momentous years became necessary, the evangelists selected such actions and sayings as brought out certain aspects of the Lord's ministry, purpose, character, and teaching. Each Gospel is arranged round one centre, or at least round a few central points. This particular aspect, this grouping point or principle of selection, is the Leading Idea of the evangelist.

The Gospels, then, are "informal memoirs" or the earthly life of Jesus pervaded by certain Leading Ideas.

II

In the Acts of the Apostles we find one important indication of the existence of the very Leading Ideas which it is the object of this work to develop in an original draft of the Gospel history

[1] *Cp. Life and Letters of Dean Stanley*, vol. ii. p. 340, where, in an account of an interview between Stanley and Newman, the latter is quoted as saying: "But then I seem to myself to see the same compulsory character (*i.e.* as in the O. T.) in the Gospels; not a regular history, but *biographical anecdotes strung together*."

by the chief of its earliest witnesses. At least a quarter of a century before any of our present Gospels was committed to writing, apostolic thought and teaching upon the earthly life of the Saviour assumed that the whole field was traversed by four principal Leading Ideas.

The fullest specimen of a "primitive Gospel" which the Church now possesses, is that which was spoken by St. Peter in his discourse to Cornelius and his company.[1] We there find the four great lines of which we have spoken.

We may take St. Peter's words in the order most natural to us.

1. The Saviour whom the Apostle preached was the Messiah attested by Hebrew prophecy. "To Him give all the prophets witness."[2]

2. The earthly life of Jesus was a "short, bright, resistless course"—resistless in the native charm of its enthusiastic benevolence. If brief in the measurement of time, it is permanent in its effect upon humanity. So far as its character from this point of view can be grasped in human language, it may be compressed into two words,—"He passed through, doing good."[3]

[1] Acts x. 34-42. Acts x. 43.

[2] ἱστόροῦσι πάντες. Acts x. 38. Surely both here and Acts xx. 23 (R.V.) "went about" is not a happy rendering. The original meaning must be—"to go, or pass right through"; and with διὰ accusative it is used for "passing through, and so reaching a goal of any kind."

3. But further, if the word which God sent by Jesus Christ was first sent to the children of Israel, it was also a word which in its intrinsic character and tendency was inevitably *universal*. His ultimate address was not to a race but to a world. "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." He by whom "peace is preached to the children of Israel" is also "*Lord of all*."[1] And as His message is universal, so His is the moral and spiritual beauty, the divine unction[2] which attracts all men who have eyes left; and His the power[3] which is capable of healing the whole[4] diseased, unspiritualised material of man's nature, oppressed under the terrible dynasty of the Accuser.[5]

4. Finally, the Church wants to rest upon the great foundation of all this; to rise to the source of all the supernatural life of this marvellous Personality. Here we have the majestic theory of it—"for God was with Him."[6] These words may, of course, be minimised or superficially understood. But like other great inspired utterances, they grow with the growth of the little ones of God. Taken by themselves, they need not signify much more than God's

[1] Acts x. 35, 36.

[2] Ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Acts x. 38.

[3] καὶ δυνάμει, *Ibid.*

[4] ἰώμενος πάντας, *Ibid.*

[5] τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*

guidance of a specially favoured servant, but they have in them the capacity of rising to the inguiding and indwelling Word—to "Emmanuel, which is, being interpreted, God with us."[1]

Now, let it be observed that the four Gospels, moulded round their Leading Ideas, exactly fill in these summary headings of the primitive Gospel, preached by St. Peter.

For Christ's life was many-sided. (1) It had its place as the historical consummation of the historical development of the purpose of God in Israel. Types and prophecy were fulfilled in Him. A great French poet has written of a dream of Boaz just before his marriage with Ruth. The account of the dream is, perhaps, partly prompted by some old cathedral window; but it embodies something of the spirit and purpose of the genealogy in St. Matthew.

> "Then in his dream, to heaven, the blue and broad,
> Right from his loins an oak-tree grew amain—
> The nice rule say it lies, like a long chain—
> Below it sang a King, above it died a God."

St. Matthew's is the Gospel of consummated prophecy, specially addressed to the Hebrew race. (2) Again, the life of Christ, looked at from the side of its practical effects, had three salient characteristics. It was a life of unresting toil, of supernatural rapidity, of triumphant and enthusiastic benevolence. In appearance it might seem at

[1] St. Matthew i. 23.

times to be feeble and isolated, baffled by the hardness and unbelief of man.[1] In reality it was strong with the strength of God. It wrought, in some true sense, upon the masses by whom it seemed to be rejected. The very style of St. Mark bears the impress of these characteristics. Christ's toilful life, its rapid movements, its joyful love in working and suffering for stricken and fallen humanity, are written as if by a hand which has had its fingers upon the Saviour's pulse, and has never since lost count of its beats. The opening invocation of *In Memoriam* expresses the purpose of the second Gospel in a single syllable—"*Strong* Son of God!" The first lines of St. Mark's record are: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."[2] It closes with the words: "they went forth, and preached everywhere; the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed."[3] (3) Further, the ministerial work of

[1] Contrast οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν (St. Matthew xiii. 58), with οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν, εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις κ.τ.λ. καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν, St. Mark vi. 5, 6. The single recourse of the evangelist's language are strained to express this divinely human self-limitation of the Son of God—as wonder is the result of ignorance, of suddenly realized disposition between concealed power, and a self-limitation of knowledge as well as of power.

[2] St. Mark i. 1.

[3] What a feeling of buoyant and helpful strength there is in ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες, κήρυξαν πανταχοῦ· τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος. St. Mark xvi. 20.

Jesus was a work of *healing* which needed to be recorded in some detail, that its certainty as a fact might not be lost in vague surmise. But there was a higher healing still; that human life was a life of sweet *sympathies* and fruitful *pardons*, which opened out new possibilities to the penitent. It was a life lived by One who, in presence of the ignorant and wandering, maintained that exquisite equilibrium of feeling which was at once just and sweet, strong and gentle! It had a special sympathy for the disinherited of the earth, for the weak and *poor*; a special sense of their present disadvantages, and yet of their possible compensations. And again, it was a life of beauty. Over it there was the movement of *angels'* wings, and the music of *angels'* songs. Its spontaneous utterances were parables of forgiveness, and words of tenderness; and the pages on which they are written are wetted with the sweetest tears which human eyes have ever shed. It began with the idyll of Bethlehem, and ended with the hands, gentle and omnipotent, lifted up to bless. A pencil of peculiar aptitudes was needed to render these aspects of the earthly life

[1] μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι καὶ πλανωμένοις. (Hebrews v. 2), a lovely summary of St. Luke's Gospel (mind, the writer ventures to surmise, by the evangelist's own hand. See Note A at the end of the volume.) Of the teaching word-smart Jesus, attributed to St. Paul in an ancient apocryphal document, *ἐν μόνοις τοιούτοις πλαταγῶ τέκνα,*—"the only One who sympathised with a world that had lost its way," *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*, 16. *Acta Apost. Apocr.* 47. Edit. Tischendorf.

of Jesus. He who should worthily fill up this sketch must not only have deep love for its subject. He would appropriately be a physician.[1] He must be endowed with æsthetic sensibility. He must also be a psychologist. He must with delicate instinct perceive, and with sufficient range of language express, *how* the great Messenger of eternal love acted upon different leading types of human *character*; how he was received by *woman*, at that time despised and half forgotten, alike by Jew and Gentile. And in tracing out these details with almost every type and form of human character and feeling, a Gospel must be written fitted for the advancing footsteps of a faith which was addressing itself to the conquest of the world. Such an instrument was found in the third evangelist. (4.) Finally,

[1] Sir. Lekie might, and indeed did, write better Greek than the other authors of the books of the New Testament. Perhaps we have heard a little too much of this since S. Jerome spoke of his "*verna simplicity, et nativum rudentis eloquentiam*." There has been too much tracing out of "classical colour, if not of imitation," in such expressions as "*Acadeo μαστέρων ἀίστα*" (v. 5), and others; too much desire to make out the sacred writer, "acquainted with the principles of perfect composition, skilled in the use of them, and attentive to the effects which they must produce on the minds of his literate readers." (Bp. Jebb.) He did not belong to that republic of letters, the greater part of whose citizens, except a few children of genius, may be divided into the second-rate men of letters, who succeeds in their own satisfaction—and the children "who are the writers that have failed." Rather, we feel more intensely how great and divine the Christ of the Gospel is, when the image, which from a mere literary point of view is imperfect, grows so sufficient to every soul that contemplates it.

a life so various and many-sided; a character so mysteriously beautiful, yet with claims so lofty, so exacting, so assertive, so imperative, will be found to need a clue to its interpretation, a theory of its origin which shall sufficiently harmonize its apparently contradictory phenomena. This it is with which we are presented by St. John repeatedly in the course of the utterances preserved by him: most markedly in the Prologue of his Gospel, and in the great witness at its conclusion—"The Word was God, and the Word became flesh—my Lord and my God!"[1]

Thus, in St. Matthew we have Christ's earthly existence as a life freely moulding itself in a pre-*designated* form; in St. Mark as a *strong* life; in St. Luke as a *tender* life; in St. John as literally a *Divine* life, the life of God humanified, lived under human conditions and to some extent limitations. In the first, we see Jesus as the Messiah; in the second, as the Son of God; in the third, as the Son of Man; in the fourth, as the God-Man. With St. Matthew, the chief factor is the conception of prophecy; with St. Mark, the conception of power; with St. Luke, the conception of beauty; with St. John, the conception of Divinity. In the first, the predominant elements are fulfilment and sacrifice; in the second, action and conquest; in the third, forgiveness and universal grace; in

[1] St. John i. 2-14; xx. 28.

the fourth, idealism and dogma, St. Matthew will ever appeal most powerfully to the Old Testament scholar; St. Mark to the ecclesiastical organizer, to him who is attracted to the outward things of Christ; while St. Luke has a voice of charm for the imaginative and tender, and St. John supplies the chosen food of the mystic and of the sacramental instinct. If we look round upon Christendom, we shall find more of one evangelist than of another in each of its tendencies and creations. St. Matthew must always be our chief guide through the Hebrew porch of the Church. St. Mark's spirit is with those who have fitted outward symbols to the Church's organic life, as expressive of inward ideas. St. Luke has the largest part in the galleries of sacred art, in the utterances of sacred poets, in the austere joy of canticles and liturgies, with missionaries, with workers in hospitals, with those who are devoted to the service of poverty and the help of penitents. St. John has the largest share in the vast volumes of dogmatic theology. From him principally faith learns the mystery of the New Birth of water and of the Spirit; the sweet and awful secret of the sacramental Presence.[1]

[1] It is to be observed that the first epistle of St. John contains a short but comprehensive synopsis of the *contents* of the Gospel at the beginning (1 John 1. 1), and a synoptical analysis of one of its *Leading Ideas* (that of *witness*) at the close (1 John v. 6, 10). The writer ventures to believe that he has elsewhere established this

III

The memorable passage of Ezekiel's prophecy, prefixed to this discussion, seems to be not without reference to the characteristics and Leading Ideas of the four constituents of the fourfold gospel. All that most truly lives is here by representation. The ox is the emblem of toil and of sacrifice; of patient, suffering, bleeding life. The lion is strong, royal, victorious. The eagle soars upward in spires, rising and falling with no apparent effort; gilding over the highest mountains and lost in the azure distances, apparently in the heaven itself. And above these three highest specimens of forms of animal life man comes, who blends in one, and carries into a higher sphere all those endowments which they possess in some measure in fact, perfectly in the conception of gifted souls.[1] Man alone is capable of sacrifice in its one true form—self-sacrifice; man alone is capable of the only conquests that are noble, of the only ideas which elevate to heaven. The great conceptions of three of the cherubic symbols—the ox, the lion, the eagle—suffering, action, thought,

[1] See especially Lange's beautiful discussion, Book I. Part vii. Sect. 2. *Life of Christ* (Vol. 1, 186–227, E.T.).

find their perfection in the truly human life and nature which is symbolised by the Man.[1]

It may be asked *how* we connect this with the Gospels, and the cherubic symbols with the Evangelists?

God appears to the prophet in human form. The canopy on which His Throne is fixed is lowered to the earth. The cherubim are seen, the sure sign of God's dwelling with His people. They are no visionary symbols. They are real, living with an intense reality. They plant their feet upon the ground. The wonderful wheel beside each cherub does not move through the air, but upon the earth. For God comes down and dwells visibly among men. His Presence is not confined to one place or one temple. He goes forth among the nations, which are represented by the powerful form of the cherubim and the wheels—

[1] The old rabbinical saying was—"Quatuor sunt qui principatum in hoc mundo tenent; inter creaturas homo, inter aves aquila, inter pecora bos, inter bestias leo." *Schemoth Rabba.* SCHOETTGEN, *Horæ Hebr.* 1168.—"Quatenus facilem eximie series atque facultates significantur, cherubis a Deo ad omnia sunt assimendum imprimis." (Ed. C. ANTONIO SERRAE. *De Natura et Notione Symbolica Cherub.* pp. 42, 93.) It is, however, to be borne in mind that representations of abstract ideas as living things really lie outside the region of Biblical symbolism. The cherubim are angels of an exalted order (Ezek. xxviii. 14-16). The gates of Eden were not kept by plant emblems (Gen. iii. 24). But this does not affect the fact that the description of the living entities is best conveyed to us by certain symbolical expressions. See *Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxii. 1, 17-43.

four being the prophetic number of catholicity. God's glory going forth from Israel to the nations on His car of progress; the throne, and above the throne, "the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it,"[1] *i.e.* not man deified, but God humanified in the Incarnation; to the Christian this is the religion and teaching of Jesus Christ. And the knowledge and worship of Jesus Christ has gone abroad by the Gospels,[2] which thus possess certain of the characteristics symbolised by the cherubim as manifested to the prophet.

This interpretation is often stigmatized as a childish play of fancy. Certain it is, however, that from the beginning it has been a favourite of Christian thought. When the interpretation was revived at Oxford some forty-five years ago, it was treated in many quarters as a mere mystic dream. Since that time, however, the passage has been profoundly studied; and modern sacred science among believing critics in Germany, as elsewhere, tends to accept this view as undeniably well-founded. No doubt among early Christian writers, there were childlike, or childish, guesses at the particulars of the symbols. The prevalent interpretation of Biblical scholars tends to the following distribution:—the ox is the symbol of *sacrifice*,

[1] Ezekiel i. 26.

[2] "Hic Domini sacra quadriga, quibus per orbem vectus subigit populos Iesu ceu iugo et sarcina levi." St. August. *Lib. de Consens. Evang.* i.-7.

and stamps the Gospel of St. Matthew; the lion represents *strength* and *victory*, and suits the Gospel of St. Mark; the Man refers to the *human sympathy* and the salvation offered to universal humanity, and, therefore, accords with St. Luke. *Heavenly aspirations* and thoughts elevated by the dogma of dogmas to the Divinity of Jesus Christ, claim for themselves the symbol of the eagle, and belong to St. John.

If there are any readers to whom this interpretation appears to dwell in a region of which they are upon principle suspicious, they will at least allow that one consideration of importance follows from it. The early, and apparently almost universal acceptance of this application—if we will not allow the term interpretation—of prophecy, proves at least that the line of thought upon which it was based commended itself to ancient Christianity. The conception of Leading Ideas, answering to mental characteristics, of the four Evangelists, was one with which they felt at home; and which, if not *created* by the symbols of Ezekiel, at least naturally *expressed itself* by them. If the symbols did not *create* the conception, the conception availed itself of the symbols.

IV

In the progress of these discussions it will be our duty to guard this conception of Leading Ideas in the Gospels from an extravagant amount of application, as well as from unjust and malignant inferences. We may close this argument with an analogy and with a practical remark.

(*a*) In the biographies of remarkable men, who touch the circumference of human life at more points than one, we may find some analogies to different Gospels, written from different Leading Ideas.

Of Socrates (who, in this like our Lord, left no writings behind him) we have representations in the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, and in the *Dialogues* of Plato. Of these, as has often been remarked, the first corresponds in its way to the synoptic; the second to the loftier and more ideal conception of St. John. But every one feels that Plato is not falsified by Xenophon, nor Xenophon by Plato—much less is the august figure of Socrates relegated to the land of shadows by the different representations of the two reporters. We combine the two images, and get a *generalized photograph*, better and truer than either separately.

Archbishop Laud, as a statesman and great ecclesiastical politician, found a congenial biographer in Heylin; but the deeper spiritual life,

the almost awful intensity of penitential self-abasement so pathetically manifested in the Archbishop's diary and in his dying speech, has found no biographer. Heylin has never touched that with one of his fingers—his Leading Idea was that of the statesman-primate, and all which lay outside was totally omitted by him. The life of Laud lay in two spheres, and Heylin had only set foot in one of the two. If any man thinks it right to be just even to Laud, he will supplement the Leading Idea of Heylin by what was evidently the Leading Idea of Laud himself, and, no doubt, of the few whom Laud admitted into the sanctuary of his soul.[1]

(*b*) The practical remark which we offer is this:

A life constructed according to Leading Ideas must necessarily assume the character of an "informal memoir"; and this, as has been most truly remarked, best preserves and continues the impression of a great personality. As a matter of fact, we have not one perfect and unbroken record of the earthly life of Jesus; but four different "projections," four different "photographs," which each individual soul has to reproduce for itself.[2] The image which we receive from them is vivified and made luminous for us by another influence. The same spirit which lay behind and below the

[1] "The *Anima interior* was not in Heylin's idea."—MORLEY, *Essays*, i. 199.

[2] See the excellent passage in Mr. Luthum's *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 16–18.

one great production of each Gospel lies behind and below each partial and individual reproduction of it. "He shall glorify Me, for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you."[1]

One thing is certain. It is not by their *style* that the four Gospels do their work; not even St. Luke's Gospel, with its undeniable superiority in this respect. It has been repeatedly said of late that the Gospels (in common with other parts of Scripture) enjoy what may be called an unfair advantage in the simple majesty and noble rhythm of our English authorised version. But it cannot be supposed that all other languages have been in a spontaneous conspiracy to elevate the sacred Books beyond their proper level in the opinion of civilised humanity. Yet, as far as one can judge, no fainter impression of the work and character of Jesus Christ is made upon the people of other lands by their inferior versions. The majesty and beauty of the Man is not a sum-total proportioned to the sum-total of the majesty and beauty of the style in which His earthly life is described. The spiritual nobility of the first is absolutely incommensurable with the intellectual nobility of the second. It is the image of Jesus which tinges, which radiates through, the wrappings of style, as the sunset through a swathe of clouds. Infinite love and wisdom struggle through words which not seldom are poor

[1] St. John xvi. 14.

and broken enough. It is not human genius masquerading, playing at Divinity in divinely beautiful language. It is Divinity condescending to veil itself partially in ordinary speech for its own high ends. Our belief in the truth of the narratives is more entire when they are told with such sacred negligence of rhetorical and literary embellishment. In the Gospels Christ comes to us, and we may go to Him, almost as in His sacrament. In the great words of the old martyr, whose broken Greek has sometimes such singular power—"we fly for refuge to the Gospel, as to the flesh of Jesus."[1]

To the Leading Ideas of the four Gospels we owe the shape which they have assumed; and to the four Gospels—partly in spite of, partly on account of, their style—we owe our knowledge of Jesus Christ.

[1] παραφεύγω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὡς σαρξ Ἰησοῦ. IGNAT. *Epist. ad Philadelph.* v.

II

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham."—ST. MATTHEW i. 1.

WHEN the martyr Ignatius was making his progress to Rome, he wrote to the Philadelphians in that strange Greek which, if at times it is broken and almost extravagant, is often pregnant with thought, and almost (one is tempted to think) just on the line of transition between inspiration and ordinary sanctity. "I have heard some," he writes, "saying, 'unless I find this in the archives I do not believe it in the Gospel;' and when I said to them, 'yes, but it stands written,' they replied, 'Ah! that is just the question.' But for me this is all superfluous. Jesus Christ is the archives—the sacro-sanct inviolable archives is His cross, and His death, and His resurrection, and the faith which

is through Him."[1] This faith must have been deep in the writer of the first Gospel, when Christianity presented itself for acceptance to the Jews, or to Christians of Hebraic origin who were to be confirmed in the Church's creed.

I

The Gospel of St. Matthew is pervaded by two Leading Ideas, and follows two fundamental conceptions.

I. It is the Gospel of the discourses. St. Matthew indeed is, in a good sense, "bodily" as opposed to "spiritual."[2] He does not record such discourses as that concerning the bread of life, nor such words as those which were breathed forth among the inner circle in the guest-chamber. Still, as Renan says, a "glory which is at once gentle and terrible, a divine power underlies the words of Jesus in St. Matthew." Many chapters are filled with the record of His teaching—the Sermon on the Mount; the instruction to the Apostles upon their first

[1] ἀρθὲν κατ' ἀρθῶν πράσσετε ἀλλὰ κατὰ γραφὴν ταῦτα, ἐνὶ θυσιαστηρίῳ λογίζεσθε ὅτι ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις εἶρα ἐν τῇ εἰκονογλῳ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ λέγοντὰν μοι αἰτεῖ· ἔτι Γεγραπται ἐπιμαθήσομαι μοι ὅτι βιβλιοπνεῦ· ἐκκὶ δὲ ἀμφίβολ ἔστιν ἐκτοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὰ δόματα ἀμφίβολ ἐ σπαρμὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐ δόματα· καὶ ἐ ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐ πίστιν ἐ δὲ αὐτόμ. IGNAT. *Epist. ad Philadelph.* viii. (*Apostolic Fathers*, Part ii. Vol. ii. pp. 271-273. Bishop Lightfoot.)

[2] πνευματικὸ—σωματικόν.

mission; the cluster of the parables of the Kingdom; the eightfold woe in the twenty-third chapter; the eschatological predictions and parables in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters.[1]

A brief answer may suffice to certain questions which have been asked, apparently for the purpose of disturbing simple Christians in the quiet enjoyment of their Master's words. How do you know that it is, indeed, the very echo of His voice which comes to you across the gulf of time? Was there a reporter in the apostolic company who could write shorthand and take sufficient notes? Are not these discourses like the speeches in Thucydides or Livy? As Christians, we are satisfied with that sentence—"the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, shall teach you all things"—that is, all things not of the first creation, which is the object of science, but of the second, which is the object of revelation:—"and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."[2] There is no tablet like a loving memory, no remembrancer like God the Holy Ghost.

2. We pass on to the second great Leading Idea of St. Matthew's Gospel.

We need not inquire whether the ancient tradition, that this Gospel was originally written in

[1] St. Matthew v.-viii.; x. 5-42; xiii. 3-52; xxiii. 13, *sqq.*; xxiv., xxv.

[2] St. John xiv. 26.

Hebrew (affirmed by Papias, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and others, but since the time of Erasmus warmly contested), is true or false. But at all events, with its contents before us, we need not hesitate to say that it bears something the same relation to the other Gospels which the Epistle to the Hebrews bears to the other Epistles. It is the Gospel of types in history, in law, in worship, accomplishing themselves, unrecognized by those to whom they specially pertained. It is the Gospel of prophecy, accumulating and interweaving its marvellous coincidences (sometimes in dark sayings like those of the thirty pieces of silver, and of the going before the disciples into Galilee[1]) round the Birth and Life, the Death and Resurrection, of Jesus. It is the Gospel of the Christ, crowning the aspirations of saints and seers, but not the carnal expectations of the Jews. It is the Gospel of true Judaism, as opposed to the corrupt Judaism of Priests and Scribes, of Pharisees and Sadducees.

This is written on its forefront. "The book of the generation,"[2] not "the history of the childhood," but the "liber de originibus Jesu"—Jesus the Messiah; the Child of Abraham, in Whom all families are to be blessed; the Heir of David's throne, yet rejected by the Jews.

[1] St. Matthew xxvi. 9; Zechariah xi. 12, 13: St. Matthew xxvi. 31, 32; Zechariah xiii. 7. [2] Βίβλος γενέσεως. St. Matthew i. 1.

(*a*) In the few opening chapters prophecy marks Him for its own. "That it might be fulfilled" is the often recurring formula. He is the Virgin's Son promised to Israel. His Name Jesus, God the Saviour, is practically the equivalent of Emmanuel.[1] From the mines and forests of the dim mysterious East gold and incense are brought to the Babe born in Bethlehem. Like the collective Israel, so the personal Israel, God's servant, is called out of Egypt, to accomplish the redemption which the historical Israel had failed to effect.[2] Round the awful cradle of the new-born King the sobs of Rachel rise, in a grief whose anguish echoes Jeremiah's strain of sorrow. He grows up in Nazareth, that the prediction of all the prophets[3] might be fulfilled, who said—"He shall be an enigma, despised of men, yet adored by those who despise Him; for he who calls Jesus Nazarene shall against his will call Him—'my Saviour, my Protector.'"[4] The voice of the forerunner, announced

[1] "Thou shall call His name Jesus. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying, they shall call His name Emmanuel—God with us." St. Matthew i. 21-23. The Emmanuel idea and dogma is at the root of the name Jesus rightly understood. See Pusson *On the Gospel*.

[2] St. Matthew ii. 15; Hosea xi. 1.

[3] διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. St. Matthew ii. 23.

[4] The most ancient interpretation of this passage is that which St. Jerome heard from some learned Jews, who became Christians. It refers it to that passage in the 11th of Isaiah, where we read of a branch growing out of the roots of Jesse. But the Hebrew word is

by Isaiah and Malachi, prepares His way. He dwells in Capernaum, that the light seen by Isaiah —a richer dawn than ever flushed the Syrian sky—may shine down upon the people that sit in darkness and the shadow of death.[1] Yet all the sign which Israel gives is this,—that when the Wise Men come from the East to Jerusalem they are near being murdered by the false king of the Jews. And the Chief Priests and Scribes of the people never visit the place to which, with prophecy in their hands, they guided others.

[1] St. Matthew's meaning in that case would be—he who contemptuously gives to the Son of David the name of Nazarene accomplishes Prophecy, for this Nazarene is the true scion, the Branch of God, growing out of the root of Jesse.

"In Hebrew the name Nazarene is pronounced *natsrip*. The Jews at this day call Jesus by this name in contempt. But the same word *natsrip* signifies also 'my Saviour,' 'my Protector.' This expression is not, indeed, found in any isolated Messianic passage in the Old Testament, but all the Prophets, without exception, represent Him as the Saviour and Protector of Israel. St. Matthew means to say —It is a stumbling-block to you that the Son of David has been brought up in this poor Nazareth. In your wish to insult Him by this reproach, you fulfil unconsciously prophecy. When you call Him *natsrip* you announce His truth: you fulfil that which the prophets foretold: you declare that He is your saviour and protector. This is one reason why He was to come from Nazareth, that those who insult Him under the name of *natsrip* should be obliged to glorify Him by saying 'my redeemer and protector,' which is, in point of fact, conformable to the word of the Prophets."—BIGERMANN *Zeitschr. f.ew.* pp. 203, 204. [אל] behold or look has the secondary signification of watching—sometimes in a hostile sense (as some understand נצר Job vii. 20), but more frequently as watching over to preserve.]

[1] St. Matthew iv. 12 *sqq.*; Isaiah ix. 1, 2.

In the Sermon on the Mount, One speaks to us Who is a new and a greater Moses—Who has given the great strokes of His life and death not to destroy, but to fill up[1] the faint sketch of the Law—to give a new law to men endowed with a new spirit.

Again, in the eighth and ninth chapters we have that ascending series of miracles, beginning with the victory over disease close at hand or far off, passing on through the calmed waters and the dispossessed demoniacs, until it finds its culminating point in forgiven sin and vanquished death. What is the first special miracle recorded by St. Matthew?—The healing of the leper.[2] Why does it stand first? Spiritually, no doubt, it follows the Sermon on the Mount, to tell how the eternal leprosy that cleaves to our race can alone be healed. Not merely by words. Not by systems of morality, whether they call themselves dependent, independent, or of the will of God. Not by one speaking royally, like a distant king from a cloud of purple and gold; nor roughly, like the police-

[1] πληρῶσαι, v. 17. Καὶ ἄλλαι δὲ ἐπέχουσι τὴν τάχιν, τοῦτεστιν ἀνενδέχομον ὅσα γὰρ ἐκείνοι ἐνεκελεύσαντο, ταῦτα οὗτοι τελεῖν εἰρηκόσιν· ἐκείνοι τὸ μὴ φονεύειν, οὗτοι τὸ μηδὲ θυμοῦσθαι κλέπτειν, ἀστεργεῖν καὶ ἐπιορκεῖν οὐ κωλύουν· ἀλλὰ μόλιν ἐπιστρεφεῖν.—Πανσεκτικὸν, *in Matt.* v. Tom. i. 23. A long catena of passages from the Fathers to the same effect in Hammond's interesting note. *Practical Catechism*, Lib. ii. Sect. 3, pp. 110-114.

[2] St. Matthew viii. 2-5.

man who bids misery clear the way; nor patronisingly, like the hard kind of good people, who have never been tempted in some directions themselves, and drop down loving texts into the sinner's sore with such acidulated accents of severe virtue that the wound smarts and throbs; nor sentimentally, like popular preachers and the "feeble folk" who write stories for little children which sometimes harden the hearts they are intended to touch. The leprosy can only be healed by one coming down from the mountain and entering into fellowship with the leper; by putting out the hand, and touching the poor defiled thing, and then, in Christ's spirit, saying to it, "be thou clean." But it is also significant that the very miracle stands in the front of St. Matthew's Gospel, which would above all others impress a reader who knew the ritual law with the conviction that the healer of leprosy was the Christ, the Son of Abraham and David.

Time goes on with its great deeds and gentle words. The satanic hatred of the Pharisees conspires for His destruction:—"the Pharisees went out and held a council against Him how they might destroy Him."[1] Then follows the victory of divine gentleness. They sought to destroy: He withdrew Himself and healed.[2] If His loving eye sees one sound and living fibre in the reed,

[1] St. Matthew xii. 14. [2] *Ibid.* 15.

He will fill the earth with His spring, and send through the reed the sap of His grace, and save it by that fibre. If He perceives one spark in the smoking wick, He will cover it with the hollow of His hand, and breathe upon it, and waken it into a light for the feast or the altar.[1] But the Pharisees blaspheme. "This fellow doth not cast out devils but by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils."[2] And judgment is pronounced,—"so it shall be also unto this wicked generation."[3]

Miracle upon miracle is wrought; yet Judaism calls for another sign, for "a sign from heaven."[4] There is one brief Hosanna, one fitful revival. Alas! the fig-tree (God's own type of Israel in Hosea,[5]) is its image. The deceptive tree deluded the hungry by the wayside. Disciples might seek for spiritual good from a system rich in leaves, but without fruits; and so be prepared for a judgement that should blast and wither the theocratic people from the very root. The words immediately following are not hyperbole. They are prophecy. "This mountain" is the temple-hill, the representative of Judaism; and the "sea" into which it is to be cast and lost is the sea of nations.[6] In the twenty-second and twenty-third chapters the great Questioner baffles the Sadducees and Scribes,

[1] St. Matthew xii. 20; cf. Isaiah xlii. 3. [2] St. Matthew xii. 24.
[3] *Ibid.* 45. [4] St. Matthew xvi. 1; cf. xii. 38.
[5] Hosea ix. 10. [6] St. Matthew xxi. 21.

and reduces the Pharisees to silence; and then pours out burning words, scathing their hypocrisy and proselytism and Jesuitical distinctions. "Ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness." The worm of death gnaws at the foundation of Judaism. It breeds stench and pestilence. And then the true Israel went out and departed from the temple, His retreating footsteps forming the prelude to the voice which was heard afterwards—"let us go hence,"—and God's Presence went with Him.[1]

The same view pervades the closing chapters.

The drama deepens to its end. He has appeared first as law-giver; secondly, as wonder-worker; thirdly, as teacher. He must be more than these.—More than law-giver. Law wakens the moral sense to obligations, towering one beyond the other into an infinite distance. Law tells the listening ear of the cruel dissonance between the discord of that which a man is, and

[1] The close of St. Matthew xxiii. and beginning of xxiv. 1, lose their terrible significance by being sharply cut in two: ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἂν εἴπητε κ.τ.λ.—καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. St. Matthew xxiii. 38; xxiv. 1. There are three divine moments here. (1) God's house becomes, not His, but ὑμῶν (ὑμῖν, ὑμῶν). (2) His inner desolation and deconsecration with all its consequences to them (ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ἔρημος). (3) The sentence actually taking effect by the departure of Jesus, and His withdrawal from the whole temple precinct (ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ).

the perfect music of that which he ought to be. Man needs something by which he may be lifted to the distant summit; by which the sense of discord may be mitigated. As the Redeemer must be more than law-giver, so He must be more than wonder-worker. The miracle comes to tell us that what we call nature is not so natural after all; that man is from time to time reached by a higher law, which touches him with its light but seldom in the centuries; that He who works it has knowledge of a great chapter, whereof that which we call law is but a poor sub-section. Man wants something more than to know even God's wisdom and power. The Saviour of a being like man must, again, be more than merely a teacher. The moral precept without requires a moral power within. The parable shows us nature with lights of God's Kingdom upon it, falling through a door which we cannot enter. Therefore, He must be more. He must be the High Priest, entering into the lowest depths; kneeling in Gethsemane, with a burden laid upon Him; hanging upon the cross, priest and victim, with the pierced hands and feet, and the wounded side, and the awful circlet of the crown of thorns, and the pale and dying lips. He must then, to make this effectual, be the King reigning in glory, and sending out heralds to gather in His people, not from one race alone, but from all lands, into a Catholic Church.

We find the same conception moulding the evangelist's materials at the close as at the beginning—accomplished prophecy and Jewish blindness. "The High Priest rent his clothes."[1] "The rent garment," says Bishop Taylor, "signifying that the priesthood should be rent away from him and from his nation. His personated and theatric horror became the type of his punishment." The dream of Pilate's wife and the washing of Pilate's hands are a silent but terrible reproach to the Jewish rulers.[2]

This is brought out more clearly by the shapes which stand in contrast with the Chief Priests, and Scribes, and Elders, as He hangs upon the cross. The Roman centurion might have seen men dying on the battle-field, but never a death like that, when Jesus "cried again with a loud voice and yielded up the ghost."[3] The women look on with pity, "beholding afar off." The rich man begged the body of Jesus. But the chiefs of fallen Judaism conspire with the heathen. "They came together unto Pilate."[4] More than that—"they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, say ye His disciples came by night and stole Him away whilst we slept."[5] And then,

[1] St. Matthew xxvi. 65.

[2] *Ibid.* xxvii. 19, 24. On dreams in St. Matthew's Gospel, see Note 2 at the end of this discussion.

[3] St. Matthew xxvii. 50.

[4] *Ibid.* 62.

[5] *Ibid.* xxviii. 12, 13.

—remembering doubtless how well they had succeeded with an Apostle,—in the spirit of the English minister who said "every man has his price" (and truly enough of most men whom he was likely to know), "if this comes to the governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you."[1]

Is there not prophecy there to those who will look below the surface? Every nation has a lower, as well as a loftier side. Ever since that fatal bribe was paid; in spite of endowments, often splendid, sometimes beautiful, in spite of magnificent ransoms to humanity paid out of the gold which Judaism has the genius for amassing; baseness about money has too often thinned the noble blood of those whose spiritual fathers were "homines desiderionum." The sad deed of fallen Judaism round the holy sepulchre has sadly avenged by the bar sinister of meanness drawn across one of the proudest escutcheons in the history of mankind.

But enough of them. Money is not almighty. Stones cannot keep down the Holy One, nor hierarchs suppress the living and the true. The Passion Week is ended. The Easter Sunday has come and gone. The Son of Abraham and David enters into His Kingdom and passes into Galilee.[2] The spell of the mountains seems to have been on

[1] St. Matthew xxviii. 14.
[2] *Ibid.* xxviii. 16.

St. Matthew, and he loved to contemplate the Son of God in those solemn sanctuaries. We remember the mountain of the Temptation,[1] of the beatitudes, of the prayer during the storm, of the Transfiguration, and finally of the meeting in Galilee after the Resurrection.[2]

"Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them." Judaism has done its worst to the bitter end. High Priests and Scribes, the heads of the ecclesiastical power and men of the dominant theological school; Pharisees and Sadducees, the precursors of religious parties that have lost their life, and become carrion things round which the eagles are gathering; the shadows that project themselves into the future, and become to us like familiar shapes—the sceptic, the Jesuit, the predestinarian, the Pharisee who is not a Protestant, and the Pharisee who is; they have killed the Holy One of God. They have wrangled and cheated, they have bribed and lied over the empty grave; but the Risen Lord is on the hills of Galilee. He is freer than the mountain air. "All power is

[1] It should be noted that the true reading of St. Luke iv. 5 has only ὑψηλὸν ὄρος ("for 3rd Hist. op," R. V.), while St. Matthew τὸ περιλαμπρὸν ὄρος ὑψηλὸν εἰς ἕνα ἐφέρετο λίαν. (St. Matthew iv. 8.)

[2] St. Matthew iv. 8; v. 1; xiv. 23; xv. 29; xvii. 1; xxviii. 16. Cf. xviii. 12; xxi. 21; xxiv. 16, as illustrating the attraction of the mountains to the humanity of our Lord.

given unto Him in heaven and earth."[1] He sends His heralds, unconfined by the narrow limits of one land, to disciple all nations by baptizing them, and promises to be with them all days, the darkest not less than the brightest, to the end of the world.[2]

Thus does St. Matthew fill up this great conception of prophecy accomplished in the Son of Abraham and David: of Him Who is the true Israel, in Whose work and Person true Judaism is concentrated, over against the false Judaism of a fallen priesthood and an apostate people.

II. We may now apply this view of St. Matthew's Gospel, first to the question of the origin of the Gospels, secondly in a practical way.

It may be looked upon as an ascertained result of criticism, that the Gospels were all written within the first century; none earlier than about A.D. 60, none later than between A.D. 80 and 90. This historical fact will seem strange to certain modern notions. Consider for a moment how the matter really stands. Let us put ourselves in imagination back to Pentecost. In those her bridal days, the young Church was filled, not with new wine, but with a holy and heavenly enthusiasm. The light of the everlasting morning had not yet ceased to flood her spires and battlements. Her

[1] St. Matthew xviii. 18, 20.
[2] *Ibid.*

tabernacle was yet on the holy hills, and the cry rose to her lips—"Lord! it is good for us to be here." With loins girded and lamps burning, she waited for her Lord's coming, and strained her eyes towards the eternal dawn. She was the "pilgrim of eternity"; and the song which she rolled out strong and grand against the winter sky was—"arise we and depart: for this is not our rest." It may be that she had not special days of commemoration, Christmas or Good-Friday, Easter or Ascension. But she lived upon her Lord's Birth and Death, upon His Resurrection and Ascension. She needed no book of His *Logia*, of His discourses or of His works. There were those with her who had seen Him on the mountain of Transfiguration; who had heard Him say, "peace be unto you," on the great Easter Sunday; and had felt joy deepening within them, as they looked upon the atoning wounds.

At first, then, there was not, and there needed not to be, any official memorial of the Lord. The sermons of the Apostles were, in many cases, it would appear, summaries of our Lord's life.[1] In portions of the apostolic Epistles, particular incidents are mentioned or assumed, though not so frequently as in Christian writings of a later date. The institution of the Eucharist is recorded in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and the

[1] Acts ii. 22-37; v. 29-33; x. 34-44; xiii. 23-40.

Transfiguration in the Second Epistle of St. Peter,[1] St. Paul speaks of the Birth and Circumcision of Jesus, and of His life of poverty.[2] The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, while asserting the continuance of miracles in the Christian society of his day,[3] implies that he recognises the fuller flood of miraculous efficacy in our Lord's ministry by adopting three words recognised for it in the Evangelists.[4] Other incidents of less primary importance are also referred to in a way which implies an acquaintance with them. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews assumes it as "evident," known to all,[5] that "our Lord has arisen out of Judah." When the same writer says, "Jesus suffered without the gate, let us go forth, therefore, unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach,"[6] we may have a reminiscence of the Saviour led out to be crucified, and of the Cyrenian bearing His cross. The "Abba, Father" of Romans and Galatians is an echo from Gethsemane; "the strong crying and tears" of Jesus in Hebrews

[1] 1 Corinthians xi. 23; 2 St. Peter i. 16, 19.

[2] Galatians iv. 4-6; 2 Corinthians viii. 9.

[3] συναναμαρτυρέω. Hebrews ii. 4: "This witness is present and not past." (Bishop Westcott *in loc.*)

[4] σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα *combined* in St. Matthew xxiv. 24; St. Mark xiii. 22; St. John iv. 43; δυνάμεις, St. Matthew xi. 20; St. Mark vi. 14.

[5] πρόδηλον. Hebrews vii. 14.

[6] Hebrews xiii. 13; cf. St. Matthew xxvii. 32; St. Mark xv. 21; St. Luke xxiii. 26.

calls up the whole scene.[1] When St. Paul desires that women "may attend upon the Lord without distraction,"[2] had he not before the eye of his mind the tender picture of the two sisters, whereof one sat at Jesus's feet, while the other was "cumbered"[3] about much serving? In the Epistle to the Galatians the baptismal "robing with Christ" is borrowed from the parable of the Prodigal; it is a hint of—"bring forth the best robe, and put it on him."[4] In the Epistle to Timothy, the Apostle urges the payment of certain presbyters on the authority of Christ's saying—"the labourer is worthy of his hire,"—and that in a way which presupposes his knowledge of the whole discourse addressed to the Seventy.[5] When St. John utters that admonition—"He that saith he abideth in Him ought also so to walk as He made His one great life-walk"[6]—whether or not we suppose that his Epistle was a circular letter accompanying the Gospel, he must have had a distinct image before his own soul, which he took it for granted was no less present to theirs. As time went on, the words

[1] Romans viii. 15; Galatians iv. 6; Hebrews v. 7. The twelfth chapter of the Revelation manifestly borrows its colouring from the birth of Jesus, and Herod's "seeking the young Child's life." Apoc. xii. 1-4, 5.

[2] ἀπερισπάστως. 1 Corinthians vii. 35.

[3] περισπᾶσθαι. St. Luke x. 40.

[4] Χρυσῆν ἐνδύσασθε. Galatians iii. 27; cf. St. Luke xv. 22.

[5] 1 Timothy v. 18; cf St. Luke x. 7.

[6] καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιεπάτησεν. 1 St. John ii. 6.

of Jesus were brought to the Church's mind according to His promise. The successive events of the Church touched and quickened the springs of memory, and events brought out the latent treasures which she possessed. "In verbis Christi semina erant totius eurus Evangelii." Thus, when the Holy Ghost began to fall on certain, St. Peter exclaims—"then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."[1] The suddenness of the Lord's Second Coming is illustrated in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, by an image of the most vivid familiarity. "Concerning the times and the seasons ye have no need that aught be written unto you." Why no need? Because they knew already, from a higher source, out of the treasures of a greater teaching, accurately, spontaneously, without need of prophecy, that the "day of the Lord so cometh as *a thief* in the night." They knew it from the recorded discourses of Jesus.[2] When St. Paul would enforce the important practical principle that the Church is not the diaphanous creature which extreme voluntaryism would make her, he remembers Christ's words—"the labourer is worthy of his

[1] Acts xi. 16; cf. i. 5.

[2] περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφεσθαι ὑμῖν. 1 Thessalonians v. 2. Cf. St. Matthew xxiv. 43; St. Luke xii. 39; 2 St. Peter iii. 10. It is interesting to find the synoptical word in the Apocalypse iii. 3, xvi. 15.

hire."[1] If he would remove morbid scruples from the sensitive conscience of the man who went to the entertainment of one who was external to the Church, he reminds the Corinthians how Jesus had spoken to the Seventy upon their mission—"eat such things as are set before you."[2] When the same Apostle deals with the question of the inviolability of the marriage bond, he falls back upon the remembered command of the Lord—"I command, yet not I, but the Lord: let not the wife depart from her husband"—the substance of His answer to the question of the Pharisees—"is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?"[3] It seems to be as certain as anything of the kind can be that an unwritten traditional life of Jesus graven upon the living heart of the Church, preceded the written life. In this, startling as it seems at first hearing to some, there is no derogation from the honour of the written word. No ark of the new Covenant overlaid round about with gold kept in its side the book of the new law. There was not, as in Bacon's fine romance of *Atlantis*, the pillar and cross of light, breaking up and casting itself into a firmament of many stars, and the branch of palm covering

[1] 1 Timothy v. 18; *cf.* St. Luke x. 7.

[2] 1 Corinthians x. 27; *cf.* St. Luke x. 8.

[3] 1 Corinthians vii. 10; *cf.* St. Matthew xix. 3, 9; *cf.* also the repetition of the scarlet word from the cross (Luke xxiii. 46) with 2 Tim. i. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 19, and 2 Tim. iv. 18 with Matt. vi. 13.

the ark of cedar which floated upon the calm mysterious sea, with the volume of the Gospels shrouded in its depths. Yet the Holy Spirit guided the memories, and freely used the intelligences of Apostles and their disciples, that His Church might know the certainty of those things wherein she had been instructed; and that across the gulf of ages, and the mists of history, down to the end of time, the eyes of Christians might see the authentic lineaments of the King in His beauty.

As to the Gospel with which we are now more directly concerned, and which the Church has always attributed to St. Matthew, a denial of its authorship has been based upon the tone of the evangelist in describing the call of St. Matthew in the ninth chapter.[1] "It is impossible," writes Schenkel, "to conceive a colder or more impersonal narrative. It is much easier to suppose the statement in St. Luke to be his, with such a vivid touch as this—'Levi made Him a great feast in his own house.'[2]" The answer to such an objection is to be found in the instinctive sentiment, which made those who had stood in the presence of the Holy One almost annihilate themselves before Him. There is a spirit which loves placard and advertisement, which multiplies tracts of which the heroes are puny or questionable saints, who write interminable experiences with eyes alternately turned

[1] St. Matthew ix. 9, 14. [2] St. Luke v. 29.

to heaven, and peering to see who is listening behind the half-opened door. It was not so with Christ's Apostles. Their motto was—"He must increase, I must decrease." It has been beautifully conjectured that St. Matthew leaves the Parable of the Pharisee and Publican to be recorded by St. Luke, because *he* is the publican from whom it was drawn. The very fact that the narrative of St. Matthew is so sober and impersonal tells for, rather than against, its composition by the publican who became an apostle.

It will be observed that our analysis, so far as it is correct, establishes the unity of the authorship of this Gospel. This has been impugned by a host of modern writers. The comparatively timid rationalism of the beginning of the century hinted that the first two chapters came from another hand. Ewald, about forty years ago, printed the first Gospel in five different types, that the reader might have before his eyes the fragments of which it is composed. Hingefeld assigns it to two authors—one earlier, one later; one forcing Christianity into a Jewish mould, the other handling it in the broader spirit of St. Paul. Köstlein asserts that it was put together from three pieces, the Syro-Chaldaic original of St. Matthew, the primitive Mark, and Galilean tradition. Schenkel very similarly analyses it into a composite of a document called the "primitive Mark"; of a second

document supposed to be spoken of by Papias as τὰ λόγια; and, added to this, of a certain amount of oral tradition.

Such theories are refuted to a candid mind, even by those subordinate traits which are to a composition what the play and trick of features is to the living face, giving it individuality and character. The transitions in St. Matthew's narrative have been called by M. Réville "simple, almost infantine." Be it so. But the τότε ("then") repeated more than fifty times, shows that one hand, however untutored, was at work. "I believe," says M. Réville again, "that no writer ever felt happier in his work." Certainly, the writer has throughout a simple, happy admiration for the things which he relates, and many of which he had seen. It is the same man throughout who gazes with a rapture that never tires. "Lo!" and "Behold!" rushes to his lips more than thirty times in this short book. The star of the Epiphany is in the east, do you not see it? "Lo! the star." The Lord is on the holy mount; the cloud of glory descends upon the hill. "Behold! there appeared unto them Moses and Elias. Behold! a bright cloud overshadowed them. Behold! a voice out of the cloud." It is Easter morning. The women go to tell the disciples[1]—"Behold! Jesus met them." The evan-

[1] See the eloquent passage in M. Réville's "Question des Evangiles." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, June 1, 1866.

gelist has been accused by others of being a sort of diffuse and garrulous Herodotus among the four, passionately fond of legend and miracle. The wonders of the Infancy, the walking of Peter on the sea, the stater in the fish's mouth, the dream of Pilate's wife, the bodies of the saints reappearing after the Resurrection, the marvels at the sepulchre, have been appealed to against St. Matthew's *credibility*; but, if they testify to his individuality, let them at least vouch for his *existence*.

Even such subordinate traits led us to the conclusion that it is one mind which addresses us. How much more must we reject the theory that this Gospel is a thin *substratum* of original writings,—beneath a stupendous layer of myths, discourses evolved out of the Church's consciousness, and agglomerated fragments of other documents,—when we perceive that the whole mass of the composition is not only thinly traversed by particular lines of thought, but moulded and shaped throughout by certain Leading Ideas.

2. It remains to apply practically what has been said of this Gospel as a whole.

(*a*) There is an eternal freshness in it. Pharisees washing their hands, and making the phylactery very broad and the tassel very long; pedantic scribes, mocking human nature with subtleties fine and glossy, but sharp and piercing as threads of glass; the haughty priests of a corrupt establish-

ment, and its sceptical and mocking Sadducees; the wild demoniac; the publican, the man seemingly dead and buried in material pursuits, yet obeying the "call of Jesus"; the woman of Bethany, pouring from her broken heart perfumes which were dearer to Christ than the hoarded nard; these are the shapes, "touching and terrible," that were never forged, which live and speak to successive generations.[1]

The spirit of hypocrisy, of Pharisaism, of hollow sanctimonious and hierarchical pretension, is lasting as human nature. It is scathed in St. Matthew's Gospel; no doubt of it. Only do not let us be put off by dress. We look out for the successors of Chief Priests, of Scribes and Pharisees, in copes and chasubles, in the priest's surplice or the prelate's lawn. We may find them in other quarters, among the sentimental professors of a liberal and unsectarian Christianity, not less than among the defenders of a dogmatic creed.

Neither let us be hasty in drawing from the condemnation of *formalism* in St. Matthew a condemnation of *forms*. It is interesting to notice that the verses which put in the sharpest and clearest way the relation of the external to the spiritual element in religion are peculiar to this Gospel. "*All* the virgins," in the parable, "arose and trimmed their torches," cleared the wick in the vessel, and

[1] M. Réville, *ibid.* pp. 639, 640.

arranged the garlands[1] around the staff which bore it; "all the virgins," the wise no less than the foolish. But "they that were foolish took no oil; the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps." Christ would have neither the form without the spirit, nor the dogma without the life; neither the lamp without the oil, nor the oil without the lamp. Without the lamp, the oil will be wasted; without the oil, the lamp will not burn.

(*b*) It is this first verse that gives such fulness of significance to all this Gospel. It is because He is Jesus Christ, Son of Abraham and David, that His discourses are what they are—everlasting, powerful, the inner law of Christian society and civilization, the creative source of new courage, new thoughts, new enterprises, new saints, new apostles, new martyrs. This Gospel is not the life of a dead man. It is the specimen of an eternal life manifested upon earth for a while, by which we come to know in some measure what He is Who is our Lord. This is why it is that to leave off reading the daily lesson or chapter is to forget Christ, and with Him purity and goodness. This is why so many in the evening of their days, as they look back with bitter self-accusation, remember that the time which they most deplore coincided exactly with the time when, by shutting up their New Testament, they shut out Christ's presence from their lives. Yet, thank God,

[1] ἐστολισμέναι. St. Matthew xxv. 7.

we know Him, or we may know Him. We may know Him as the leper knew Him; as Peter did, when with the spray in his hair, and the storm-light on his face, he cried, "Lord! save me;" as Gallee knew Him, when He went about doing good. Still above the clouds that hang over the Church and the world He is the light, the dawn and Morning Star of each new era, until the final revelation, when, over the last clouds going up from a burning world, the sign shall appear. Still the shadow of the Man of sorrows hangs over the sick. Still worship is the dialogue between Him and the soul which He has redeemed with such a price.[1] Still as we kneel at the Holy Communion Sunday after Sunday, or in the stillness of the room where our dear ones lie, the Eucharist of the upper chamber is with us, as it was with those who heard and saw Him. Still those words are comfortable as of old—"come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."

(*c*) It follows, as a matter of course, that in receiving St. Matthew's Gospel the Church commits herself to a definite and very exalted view of Jewish history and prophecy. To this view, indeed, she is committed with her very life, because her Master is so committed. Whatever theories may be formed of possible limitations of His human knowledge, to suppose Him ignorant of a matter so directly

[1] See Pressensé. *Vie de Jésus*, in the closing pages.

bearing upon the purpose of His mission, is to suppose Him fatally incompetent for the execution of the very work which He came to perform. The Church will follow the course of all true criticism of the Hebrew Scriptures with a deep and reverent interest, without panic and without perturbation, with fearless patience and with perfect impartiality. All that is proved she will accept, and find her vision enlarged. All that is conjectural, however exquisitely ingenious, she will let pass with a sigh or with a smile. The spirit of the first Gospel will help her to discriminate in Judaism that which is accidental and merely part of the equipment of preparation from that which is living and eternal. The first of these elements of Judaism is like the rusted anchor which lies upon the shore, or like the torn and sodden nest in the wood. The second is like the vessel which the anchor once held, now moving far away upon the sea; or like the bird, once helpless in the nest, now exulting in its liberty. More and more the Church will be guided, not so much to learn Christ from the Old Testament as to learn the Old Testament from Christ; not so much to learn the New Testament through the Old, as to learn the Old Testament through the New.

NOTE I.—1, 2 (a).

ST. MATTHEW II. 1-2.

IT is instructive to remark in this portion of St. Matthew's narrative the historically sustained character of that very portion of the Gospel which might seem to be most peculiarly near the dreamland of legend. Let us note two points: (*a*) That there is no exaggeration about the star or meteor. (*b*) That no *prophecy* of the Epiphany is alleged.

(*a*) The star of the Epiphany early lent itself to embellishments, the occurrence of which in a genuine Gospel would at once have committed Christianity to a crushing defeat. A writer generally so sober as Ignatius, and who died only about fifty years after the publication of the first Gospel, writes as follows:—

πᾶν οὖν ἐφανερόθη τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἄστρῳ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας, καὶ τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκλάλητον ἦν, καὶ ξενισμὸς παρῆλθε ἡ καινότης αὐτοῦ· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἄστρα ξὺν τῷ ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ χορὸν ἐφάνετο τῷ ἀστέρι, αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑπερβάλλων τὸ φῶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάντα· ταραχὴ τε ἦν πόθεν ἡ καινότης ἡ ἀνόμοιος αὐτοῦ· ὅθεν ἐλύετο πᾶσα μαγεία, . . . θεοῦ ἀνθρωπίνως φανερουμένου καινότητα εἴδετε ζωὴν ἀρχὴν τῶ ἀιῶνος τὰ γὰρ ἐνῆν ἐπιφανείας (*Epist. Ignat. ad Ephes.* xix.). This is one of two passages where Ignatius goes beyond the Gospels. (*Addern, φιλοκαίνεν* and, and there for, *οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀνάρκατον. ad Smyrn.* xi. LIGHTFOOT, *Apost. Fathers*, Part II. Vol. i. p. 295, 296 *c f.* St. Luke xxiv. 36-38, 39.)

A passage of lofty poetical grandeur on the subject of the star is contained in one of the Sibylline Oracles (*ἀνάλλαξε οὖν τὸν λόγον, καὶ εἴπω τὸν λόγον ἐκεῖνον ὃν εἶπεν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν ἀστέρα κ.τ.λ.—Protevang. Jacob.* 18).

Evang. Apocryph. TISCHEND. p. 53. Bishop Lightfoot quotes Milton's:

"The stars with deep amaze
Stand fix'd in stedfast gaze."

One must add that the impression of these magnificent sciences in the *Protevang. Jac.* is frittered away by a multitude of petty details and the usual theatricalism of these documents. Surely no writer of the class to which St. Matthew evidently belonged could have kept his fancy within bounds unless he had been restrained and cabined by the stern repression of *truth*. The very *silence* of an evangelist is *inspired*.

(3) The same restraint may be observed in another marked abstinence in the Epiphany narrative. It has become a commonplace of rationalistic criticism to say that "the Epiphany is a picture created by prophecy." St. Matthew again and again in these opening scenes marks the prophetic pages with a coloured pencil. In the visit of the Magi we have an incident of surpassing imaginative beauty. All through the ages it has been glorified by pencil and song. Yet, singular to say, the Epiphany is the *only scene* in the sublime opening of the drama of the life of Jesus, for which St. Matthew *claims no prophecy whatever*. We are tempted to think that he might have referred to Balaam's footsteps (Numbers xxiv. 17). The Church in her Epiphany services has seen the bending forms of kings in the dim magnificence of the language of psalmist and seer. (Psalm lxxii. 10-15; Isaiah ix. 6.) Still the fact remains that over the *Epiphany* scene in the chapters St. Matthew makes no hue nor joy-bells of prophecy filling the air. If he had foreseen that he would have been accused of translating a picture of prophecy into the language of fact, he could scarcely have taken a more effectual way of defending himself than by omitting between vv. 11 and 12 of chap. ii. his familiar *formula* ΤΟΤΕ ΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ.

NOTE II

Dreams find a distinct mention in St. Matthew's Gospel. We have the dream of the wise men (ii. 12), of Joseph repeatedly (i. 20; ii. 13, 19, 22), of Pilate's wife (xxvii. 19). To St. Matthew, with his deep view of prophecy, the dream may have seemed the faint reflection of it vouchsafed to pure souls outside the theocracy. (ii. 12; xxvii. 19.) Joseph, the carpenter, like another Joseph (Genesis xxxvii. 5-12), is a dreamer of dreams, and thrts, even in sleep, is a fitting "sentinel at the door of the Infant-king." The moral and spiritual uses of dreams might well form a practical chapter in a complete treatise on Christian psychology. The first Lord Lytton, in one of his earlier writings, remarks upon the notices of the stability growth of evil passions afforded by dreams. A great Christian thinker has left some precious pages upon this night-side of human nature. "Bad people," he says, "cannot well have good dreams. And good dreams are much truer signs of a man than bad dreams." "Dreams," writes Archbishop Leaf, "are not in the power of him that hath them, but in the unwillness of fancy, which in broken deep wonders which way it pleases, and shapes what it pleases." Mr. Mozley[1] further remarks the "affectionate and devotional character in Laud's dreams," *e. g.* "Sunday night. My dream of my blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. One of the most comfortable passages I ever had in my life." To dream of Christ is to dream like Joseph, and probably to live like Joseph. The amplification of the message about her dream sent by Claudia Procula, Pilate's wife, is considered by Tischendorf to throw some real light upon the incident. (*Evang. Apoc.* 189, 190.)

[1] Mozley's *Essays*, 148-150.

III

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. MARK'S GOSPEL

"The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."—ST. MARK i. 1.

I

WE may, probably, best arrive at the Leading Ideas of St. Mark's Gospel by a notice of his main characteristics.

1. The main characteristic of this evangelist is his *vividness*, that quality which an eloquent critic has thus described in Mr. Carlyle's historical writings:—"He is great in single figures and striking episodes, but wants gradation and continuity. He sees history as it were by flashes of lightning. A single scene, a single figure is minutely photographed. Every tree and stone, almost every blade of grass, the attitude or expression of a principal figure, the gestures of a momentary passion, everything leaps into vision under that sudden glare."[1]

[1] Mr. Lowell. *My Study Windows.*

(*a*) If St. Matthew loves to lead us back to the past, with St. Mark that past seems to become living. Hence he constantly uses the present tense in his narrative.

(*b*) "Immediately"[1] is his "catchword." In two cases, at least, it is repeated three times in three consecutive verses. It occurs not less than forty-two times in this short book.

(*c*) The double negative is constantly found.

(*d*) When he recedes the language of any persons who are introduced into the narrative it is frequently almost dramatic in its liveliness. Often, indeed, sentences preserved by him reproduce the hurry and eagerness of the moment. We seem to hear the fluttered words, spoken with a beating heart by one panting for breath. To select one example. "I see men as trees walking," may be resolved into three sentences. "I see men." "I see them still and unmoving as trees." "I now see them walking."[2] The ἐᾶ of the evil spirit (not "let us alone," but the "alas," the sigh of immortal anguish); the οὐά of the revilers, who pass by the sufferers on the cross, is set down by St. Mark.[3]

(*e*) Life-like details drop from his pencil, until narratives for which there are parallels in the other synoptics, seem to be pre-eminently his. Witness

[1] εὐθὺς.

[2] Bishop Wordsworth on St. Mark viii. 24.

[3] St. Mark i. 24; xv. 29.

the leper "beseeching Him and kneeling down to Him;"[1] and three successive tempests in the fourth and fifth chapters,—the storm in the lake, the storm in the demoniac's soul, the storm of sorrow in the troubled hearts of a bereaved home. The narrative abounds in pictorial touches. We may remind ourselves of these. The veil of the heavens rent over the baptism of Jesus.[2] The "green grass" in the wilderness, and the companies disposed like garden plots.[3] In the night, upon the hill, under the vault of heaven, the brightness which surpasses art, and which nature can only match in her aspects of most delicate beauty, "exceeding white as snow, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them;" the epileptic boy, who wallowed groaning, and the father crying with tears, at the foot of the mountain, in the common day.[4] Jesus "going before" the disciples on the way to Jerusalem.[5] The lowering and fallen looks[6] of him who came running and kneelt to Jesus, contrasted with the loving expression of the Master's face.[7] The name of Bartimæus, his casting away the garment in which he was wrapped, and springing up toward Christ;[8] the encouraging word of those who hailed Bartimæus, "be of good comfort, rise, He calleth thee."[9] The fig-tree withered upward

[1] St. Mark i. 40.
[2] σχιζομένους. *Ibid.* vii. 35, 40.
[3] *Ibid.* ix. 3, 17, 18 *sqq.*
[4] *Ibid.* x. 32.
[5] *Ibid.* xi. 17, 21.
[6] *Ibid.* vv. 17, 21.
[7] *Ibid.* x. 21.
[8] *Ibid.* x. 49.
[9] *Ibid.* x. 49.

from the roots.[1] The figure of the Lord, sitting over against the treasury, and praising her who gave the mite which has borne such accumulated interest.[2] That other picture of Him, sitting upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, and joining in His discourse the end of that august pile with the end of the world, in words before whose majesty the genius of Shakespeare himself, in his latest and most perfect lines, seems weak:—

> "The gorgeous towers, the cloud-capt palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve."[3]

The young man so enthusiastically following Jesus, so quickly flying from danger.[4] The High Priest, stung with anger, rising and springing forward into the midst with unpriestly fury.[5] Peter warming himself towards the fire, with the blaze showing the working of his features;[6] then flinging himself into the thought of his sin, and sobbing long and loud.[7] The simple grandeur of the words—"when the centurion saw that He so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God."[8] The stone seen

[1] St. Mark xi. 21.
[2] *Ibid.* xiii. 3 sqq.
[3] *Ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀγχιμάχης εἰς μάχαν.* xiv. 60.
[4] *Θυμωθεὶς ἐφεύγει τὴν ῥάβδον.* xiv. 54.
[5] *Ἐνδιδοῦν.* xiv. 72. This is differently explained by some.
[6] Drawing his mantle over his head (the Oriental *ἀγκὴ*) he began to weep.—STANLEY *on 1 Corinthians* ix. 7.
[7] St. Mark xiv. 39.
[8] *Ibid.* xiii. 41 sqq.
[9] xiv. 51, 52.

through the doubtful light of the earliest dawn—"for it was very great."[1]

(*f*) Hence, also, we naturally find in St. Mark those personal traits of our Lord which could only have come from an eye-witness, or from one who writes under the guidance of an eye-witness, and reproduces his reverential love. Syro-Chaldaic words which dropped from the lips of Jesus are preserved.[2] St. Mark is the artist who has finished that perfect figure which our Church places over her baptisteries. "Having taken up the children in His arms and put His hands on them, He blesses them," rains down blessings on them,—a word which, in the LXX., so rich in terms of benediction, does not occur, and in the New Testament here only.[3]

As life goes on with most of us, there are moments when the look of those we love comes back upon us. Their sympathy, their grief, their noble indignation, speak to us from unforgotten features, when the curtain is drawn aside for a moment from the picture gallery of memory. A son will suddenly remember, in after years, a sigh which his father heaved, perhaps over his wilfulness or sin. This Gospel is a record of the looks of Jesus.[4] We may

[1] St. Mark xvi. 4.

[2] *Ibid.* v. 41; vii. 34; xv. 34. Most remarkably of all xiv. 36.

[3] κατευλογεῖ, x. 16. The word, however, is found in Tobit twice—Tobit x. 12; xi. 12.

[4] St. Mark iii. 34; viii. 33; x. 21, 23; xi. 11; xv. 34, the sigh of Jesus.

refer to one passage because an unjust inference has been drawn from it. "There is an expression in Mark," says Schenkel, "which shows that before His last entry into Jerusalem, Christ had never attended a festival there. Upon His arrival He betook Himself to the Temple and *looked round about* upon all things.[1] Therefore, until then, He had never seen the edifice at hand. But this is quite inconsistent with John, who tells us of His having driven the traders from the Temple at the very beginning of His career." How much more truly did our Christian poet understand St Mark:

> "On Sunday eve, with many a palm,
> With many a chant divine,
> It came, that eye so keen and calm,
> Like a still harp, far-searching aisle and shrine."[2]

It is not the stranger's look of curiosity. It is the anticipation of the victim; it is the visitation of the Judge.

(*g*) Equally, perhaps, with St. Luke, St. Mark ventures to tell how the Son of God *felt*. Now "He was moved with compassion;" "perceived in His spirit;" "looked round about with anger, being grieved;" "called unto Him whom He would;" "marvelled at unbelief;" "was much displeased;" "beholding, loved;" "sighed deeply in His spirit."[3]

[1] περιβλεψάμενος πάντα. xi. 11. See Schenkel, *Charakterbild*, p. 342.

[2] i. 41; ii. 8; iii. 5; iii. 13; vi. 6; x. 14, 21; viii. 12. One of St. Mark's objects seems to be to bring out the self-imposed limitations of the Redeemer's *knowledge* and *power* in the days of

(*b*) Nor is this vividness merely the product of an opulent fancy. It is the consistency in details of a picture, whose central figure is "drawn in lines of fire." Those rapid and decided touches are inspired by a conviction of the love, the glory, and the strength of "Jesus, the Son of God." The canvas may seem to a merely critical eye to be overcrowded, the facts to be hurriedly accumulated. But if there is the hurry, there is also the glow and energy of life. There are words that flash out like the sword of God. High above all towers the one central figure. The natural blindness and listlessness of the disciples, nowhere else so fully exhibited, enhances His majesty. They who cried with fear, when the gust from the mountains which they knew so well swept the waters of the lake on which they had rocked from childhood, enhance by contrast the calmness of Him who says to wind and wave—"peace, be still!"[1] In no other evangelist does the divine death stand out with nobler elevation than in the quiet and tremendous simplicity of St. Mark's narrative.

2. The influence of St. Peter upon this Gospel (attested by antiquity with one voice) may be repeatedly traced in its peculiarities. We can

His flesh. St. Mark vi. 6 compared with Matt. xiii. 58 is very striking. Cf. also i. 45; v. 32 (St. Luke viii. 45, 46); iii. 20; vii. 24; viii. 32. The entirely divine *non peccavimus*, the almighty *ei Θεοῦμαι* of St. John v. 29, 30 belongs to a different sphere.

[1] St. Mark iv. 39.

hear throughout the voice of the Apostle, who wrote, "Marcus, my son."[1]

(*a*) We not unfrequently find minute pieces of information, which must apparently have come from St. Peter. Most remarkable of all, however, is the humility, the self-effacement of the holy Apostle.[2] It is striking, indeed, to compare his confession, and what follows it, in the eighth chapter of St. Mark with the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew. St. Mark omits much of St. Peter's noble words, omits the marvellous attestation, omits the astonishing promise, yet gives the rebuke in its most pointed form.[3] His accurate note of the second crowing of the cock aggravates the Apostle's guilt, because it shows that the first had failed to awaken his conscience.[4]

(*b*) To us there seems to be something very remarkable in the coincidence of the primitive Gospel of St. Peter (already referred to at some length) with the skeleton of the beginning of the second Gospel—"That saying ye yourselves know, which was published throughout all Judæa beginning from *Galilee*, after the *baptism which John preached*; how God anointed *Jesus of Nazareth*."[5] So spoke St. Peter. Hence it will be

[1] St. Peter v. 13.

[2] The only apparent exception is the addition of the three words (καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ) in the angel's message to the women (Mark xvi. 7); *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 7.

[3] St. Mark viii. 33. [4] *Ibid.* xiv. 72. [5] Acts x. 37-38.

seen that the initial mould are type of the Gospel of St. Mark is entirely *Petrine*. That Gospel has *three* definite starting-points, local and temporal. (1) St. Mark takes his *first* departure from John's baptism: "John did baptize in the wilderness."[1] (2) The *second* note, a local one, is *Galilee*, and connects itself with the chronological mark of being subsequent to John's baptism. "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God."[2] (3) A *third* special word is one that connects Jesus with *Nazareth*: "In those days Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee."[3] The two schemes, the two ways of looking at the great Ministry in its beginnings, are in absolute accordance. They come either from the same mind, or from two minds habituated to the same region of Christological thought.

(*c*) Indeed, St. Peter's addresses, recorded in the second and tenth chapters of the Acts, prove that this is just such a Gospel as he would have dictated or inspired. Both are direct and practical in their tendency. Both dwell mainly on the objective facts of the Gospel. Both exhibit the Lord's life as a career of active benevolence.

[1] St. Mark i. 2-11. [2] St. Mark i. 14. [3] St. Mark i. 9.

II

These characteristics of style and origin are well suited to bring out the Leading Ideas and primary object of the Gospel.

i. Its Leading Ideas.

(*a*) One of these is, that Jesus is Lord, not only of nature and the world of spirits, not only of storms and diseases, but of the sick, stormy, guilty, sorrowing, passionate, ignorant, yet yearning heart of man. He speaks; men are "astonished and amazed." He moves from place to place; wherever He goes, He is the magnet of the human soul. "All men seek for Him." Even when He is shrouded far in the silence of the desert, even when He is in the house, "He cannot be hid."[1] Still as He walks His way of life, rays of supernatural light stream from the sky, that is usually so cold and passionless, round the pathway of the Galilean peasant. They fear, as we all fear, when the sound of the tide of eternity suddenly breaks upon our ear, and we see for a moment the heaving and glimmer of its awful waves. "They fear exceedingly," and "are astonished with a great astonishment," and "are sore amazed in themselves." As that master-hand sweeps without effort the chords of the human soul, its deepest and finest tones—amazement, wonder,

[1] St. Mark vii. 24.

reverence, trust, adoration—answer to the marvellous touch.[1]

(*b*) A second Leading Idea of St. Mark's Gospel is, that the life of Jesus is a life of alternate rest and victory, withdrawal and working.

So, in the first chapter, we find the retirement in Nazareth, the coming forth to be baptized; the withdrawal into the wilderness, the walk in Galilee; the rest in the cool sanctuary, where the dawn breaks upon the kneeling man, and the going forth to preach to the heated and struggling crowd. Thus, once more, the withdrawal to the Mount of Olives is followed by the great conflict of the redeeming Passion, while that is succeeded by the withdrawal into the sepulchre. It is the book of the wars of the Lord and the rest of the Lord. The first rest was in Nazareth; the first trophies were the four Apostles. The last rest is in the heaven of heavens, "in the privacy of glorious light"; the last victory (for this great book never ended with the words "they were afraid") is dif-

[1] This conviction of the power of Jesus lies at the root of the right interpretation of one passage which has seemed specially perplexing, Mark vii. 18, 19, is to be taken as follows: "And He saith unto them: [Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive that whatsoever thing . . . goeth out into the draught?], purging all meats," *i. e.* He saith to them all the words in parenthesis from **καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς** (v. 18) down to **ἐκκαθαίρων** (v. 19). He saith this to them; and by this saying, He, the God of nature and of the law, at one sweep "maketh all meats clean." The cleansing is contemporaneous with the saying.

fused over all time—"the Lord working with them, and confirming the work with signs following."

2. As to the primary object of St. Mark's Gospel.

St. Mark addressed himself specially to the Latin element in humanity.

The origin of this Gospel was placed in Rome by Clement of Alexandria, and connected by him with St. Peter's labours in that city. Though there is no authority for the story that it was written in Latin (which would not have been necessary in the early Roman Church), it contemplates the Latin race, and is addressed to Latin thought.

The second Gospel contains several Latin words;[1] some of them, as we are occasionally told with a peculiar sneer, "somewhat imperfectly Grecized." In one instance the names of two individuals are mentioned, who would be known to members of the Roman Church—Alexander and Rufus.[2]

But we have something which lies much deeper than these somewhat superficial indications.

The Roman temperament was eminently practical. "Their earliest character," it has been said, "was steady agricultural thrift. This was turned into the steady pursuit of conquest, and all by the practical method and spirit."[3] A powerful writer

[1] ii. 41; vi. 8; vii. 4; xii. 41, 42; xv. 16, 39, 44. Roman customs are referred to, x. 12; xiv. 30, and Jewish customs explained, vii. 3 sqq.; the equivalent in Roman money of a Greek piece is given xii. 42. [2] xv. 21; cf. Romans xvi. 13. [3] Mr. Carlyle.

on the subject remarks that "the old Roman religion is the most practical that ever existed." He points, in confirmation, to their worship, which was symbolical and undogmatic; to their deities, who, so far as they were of the Roman stamp, were virtues personified; to their pontifis, who were largely charged with legal and material interests; to their Lectisternia, which were rather repasts for social union than religious banquets; to their whole idea of the gods, which was that of a hostile nation of indisputable strength.[1] There can be no doubt, however, that at the time of our Lord's Ministry, the Roman mind had begun to be honeycombed by scepticism.

In St. Mark's Gospel, accordingly, we find not so much the highest ideas explanatory of facts, as facts themselves. The whole Gospel is a commentary on one epithet, the use of which in the first line of *In Memoriam* has been stigmatized as affectation—"Strong Son of God!" Throughout, the notion of strength is kept in view. Never was bell stronger on earth than when Jesus taught in Galilee. There are times when the usual equilibrium of moral and spiritual life is disturbed; when we are tempted to ask, with Bishop Butler, why whole masses of men should not go mad at once; or to say with the French physician, as he looked upon a population, half of them stupefied

[1] "La Théocratie Romaine." Par M. Henri Rucher. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15, 1871.

and another half frantic, that they are seized with epidemic insanity. Such a time was that when Jesus walked upon earth. In the lurid darkness of eras like these, Satan finds a home in the seething human soul. Nowhere is the personality of evil spirits, the interpenetration of the human consciousness by them, more clearly noted than by St. Mark.[1] Nowhere is Satan so emphatically the strong one, —Jesus the stronger. But this strength is not the strength of magic with its formulæ and incantations. The second Gospel is pervaded by an intense conviction that it is His word which is so mighty. The weapon of victory is the "new teaching,"[2] the assurance of forgiveness that penetrates the nervous system as with an electric stream, and works from within outwardly.[3] To the Roman admiration of strength and heroism, as well as to the scepticism of its then exhausted speculation, St. Mark seems to say,—Here is a plain account—so plain and straightforward that it cannot be suspected—of the words and works of Jesus Christ. You admire power, and make ambition virtue. With His calm superhuman eye He sees through it, and knows its littleness. For Him conquerors and kings are "they who are accounted to rule over the Gentiles"—those who seem to themselves and others to rule, while they are the slaves of irresist-

[1] Note the unscribne participle with the neuter noun, ii. 20, 26; *cf.* i. 22, 23; v. 2. [2] διδαχὴ καινή, i. 27. [3] ii. 5.

ible circumstances and unresisted lusts.[1] Here is a holier heroism, here is a stronger strength, here is a royalty of love. Here is the victory of Him Whom one of your own rough centurions declared to be really the Son of God; Who was crowned with the twisted thorn, and stood in the Praetorium, and had the fuled purple of one of your soldiers flung upon Him, but is now set down at the right Hand of God, and strongly works with the Church, which you see strongly advancing to her victory.[2]

III

If we venture to express respectful regret that St. Augustine should have appeared to speak as if St. Mark was simply the "*pedissequus et breviator Matthei*;" we do it for the purpose of drawing out our immediate subject more fully.

1. It will be useful to bring together certain words of our Lord, and certain incidents in His ministry, which are peculiar to St. Mark. We shall then be able to decide whether the second synoptical evangelist is merely the epitomizer of St. Matthew.

a. Without the Gospel according to St. Mark,

[1] *ut honoriores fuerunt.* St. Mark x. 42.

[2] Riggenbach gives a sentence curiously illustrative of this view of Mark's as a practical Gospel answering to the Roman character; "As the interpreter of the Apostle of action, St. Mark describes the Son of God in the power of His actions to the Romans who are the people of action."—Riggenbach, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 30.)

the Church would have lost these among other sayings of Jesus.

We should not have possessed the great axiom (the safeguard at once against superstition and irreverence in regard to all positive institutions whatever)—"the sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath."[1] The two great words would be away—"peace, be still!"[2] Something surely would be wanting to the parables, if we had lost that exquisite illustration of the development of God's kingdom: the seed growing, not mechanically or in virtue of cultivation, but from within outwardly, by the energy of its hidden life.[3] Here, too, we see one ray of moral light falling upon the corruption from which the fastidious imagination turns away sickened.[4] Here, again, in its fullest and most emphatic form, stands that saying which has nerved so many of God's children to face the syllogism, the epigram, and the scaffold. In St. Luke—"whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and Mine;"[5] in St. Mark—"whosoever shall be ashamed of Me and My words in this adulterous and sinful generation."[6] In this Gospel only stand the closing words of Isaiah[7] taken up and thrice

[1] ii. 27. [2] iv. 39.

[3] St. Mark iv. 26, 29. The ὡς γὰρ τὸ λεπτὸν ἀνεβλάστησε is an important addition to Matt. xiii. 22. Luke viii. 14.

[4] καταβαίνω πάντα τὰ βρώσιμα. St. Mark vii. 19.

[5] ἐπαισχυνθῇ. St. Luke ix. 26. [6] St. Mark viii. 38.

[7] Isaiah lxvi. 24.

repeated—"where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Here alone occurs in its perfect form that awful image, derived at once from the Jewish ritual and from the realm of nature. The Judge of mankind tells us that as every offering was offered with salt,[1] so every human soul must be seasoned by the flame of self-sacrifice and sanctified suffering, or by that of wrath; that it must be bathed in heavenly fire, or preserved undying in the fire of hell—"every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt;"[2] that the sharp salt of *τόπος*[3]-sacrifice, can alone preserve us from moral putrefaction, and teach us the secret of true peace with others. Peculiar to St. Mark's version of the discourse upon the last things, is that sudden reiterated note as of a trumpet, or tolling as of a bell—"take ye heed, watch and pray; watch ye therefore; watch."[4] In the same connection we must not forget three memorable words. He Who in the unity of that undivided Person is God and Man sometimes speaks as if (to use human language) He forgot that He was not in heaven, looking upon all things in the calmness of the perfect and eternal light: sometimes, again, as

[1] How powerful is St. Mark's rendering of *ἅλατι ἁλισθήσεται* (St. Matthew v. 13; St. Luke xiv. 34)—*πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται*, "salt that is unsalted." (St. Mark ix. 50.)

[2] St. Mark ix. 44, 50.

[3] *ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλας, καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις*.—v. 50.

[4] xiii. 33, 35, 37.

if earth were indeed His *home* for a season, as if His prospects were bounded for a while by our lower horizon. "Of that day or hour knoweth none, neither angel in heaven, *nor the Son*, but the Father only."[1] Let it not be forgotten that the word of commendation is found in St. Mark exclusively, which, even within the last few years, dwelt as a burning fire in one woman's heart,[2] enabling her to persevere in a work for the pauper-sick, which will never pass away—"she hath done what she could."[3] Here also we find the definite prediction to St. Peter—"even in this night, before the cock crow twice."[4]

3. Nor can the incidents peculiar to the Gospel fairly entitle us to say of St. Mark—*solus ille perpaucis*.[5]

[1] xiii. ver. 32. On the reading here, see N. T. Tisch. (Edit. vii. p. 292.)

[2] Agnes Jones.

[3] St. Mark xiv. 8.

[4] Would (not without some reason) looks upon the second Gospel as claiming something like superior importance in the record of miraculous cures (vii. 31–37; viii. 22–26; ix. 14–29), and dispossession of demoniacs (v. 1–20). He also remarks upon the use of external things; upon certain pathological inquiries; upon spittle, encouraging, soothing looks and touches, which afford a sort of intermediate ground between the natural *treatment* and the supernatural *healing*: (v. 27; vi. 13, 55, 56; ix. 22, 23; x. 41; vii. 34; i. 38–42; v. 41; vi. 5; vii. 32; viii. 23, 25; ix. 27—undisturbed quiet with the patient, v. 37. Possibly some training in the therapeutics of the ministry of the disciples may be implied, iii. 15; vi. 7). It may be added that two thoughts about these cures are specially brought out by St. Mark. (1) That Jesus conditioned and limited His own power

[5] *Ibid.* xiv. 20.

In these directions are the following:—

The second Adam with the wild beasts in the wilderness, while the whole forty days are filled up with one long silent suggestion of the evil one;[1] His mother and brethren taking steps to arrest Him, on the score of ecstatic absorption;[2] His sleeping in the storm on the pillow;[3] that one ray of light in the other storm, "He *saw them* toiling in rowing;"[4] the restoration of the deaf man with an impediment in his speech, and of the blind man of Bethsaida;[5] His design of remaining hidden in a house; His return to the sea of Galilee; the disciples having one loaf with them in the ship;[6] the history of His work along the Gaulonite range, east of Jordan; His speaking openly the sayings about His Passion;[7] the sudden disappearing of the heavenly visitants from the Mount of Transfiguration, "the questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean," the awe of the multitude at the yet unfaded brightness of His countenance;[8] the loving displeasure against the

by the faith of the patient (vi. 5, 6; ix. 23). (2) That, as He often experienced ingratitude for His works of love (St. Luke xvii. 17), so He sensitively felt it (St. Mark ix. 19). Some toll accompanied this part of His work: possibly great expenditure of vital energy (St. Mark v. 30; cf. St. Luke vi. 19; viii. 46). He healed from perfect love and pity, even where gratitude was wanting.

[1] St. Mark i. 13.
[2] *Ibid.* iv. 38.
[3] *Ibid.* vii. 32 sqq.; viii. 22 sqq.
[4] *Ibid.* viii. 32.
[5] *Ibid.* iii. 21, ἐξέστη.
[6] *Ibid.* vi. 48.
[7] *Ibid.* viii. 24; xi. 1; viii. 14.
[8] *Ibid.* ix. 8, 10, 15.

disciples who forbade the little children to come to Him;[1] the not suffering any vessel to be carried through the Temple;[2] the breaking of the alabaster box in the noble extravagance of love;[3] the emphatic record that all drank of the Eucharistic cup;[4] the repetition of the words in Gethsemane;[5] the young man, probably St. Mark himself, who left the linen cloth, and fled away naked;[6] the High Priest starting into their midst;[7] Peter beneath in the palace;[8] the first crowing of the cock;[9] the names of the sons of the Cyrenian;[10] and, finally, the special appearance to Mary Magdalene after the Resurrection.[11]

But we find much more than isolated words, or traits of single incidents peculiar to the second Gospel. Narrow as the canvas is to which the painter has confined himself, there is one whole aspect of our Lord's work brought out with unapproached excellence by St. Mark. There are incidents of importance in which, when we compare him with the other synoptics, we recognize an actual superiority, not only in vividness of touch, but in apprehension of general purpose.

[1] St. Mark x. 14.
[2] *Ibid.* xiv. 3.
[3] *Ibid.* xiv. 39.
[4] *Ibid.* xiv. 60.
[5] *Ibid.* xvi. 68.
[6] *Ibid.* xiv. 9.
[7] *Ibid.* xi. 16.
[8] *Ibid.* ver. 23.
[9] *Ibid.* ver. 51.
[10] *Ibid.* ver. 66.
[11] *Ibid.* ver. 21.

[11] *Ibid.* xvi. 9. To the incidents about St. Peter peculiar to the second Gospel add *Ibid.* i. 36.

One great aspect of our Lord's earthly life, is that it was the life of a *teacher*, a life of *toil*. All will admit this. But, when the thoughtful Christian comes to ask himself the foundation for the impression, he will probably find that St. Mark manages to produce it in the most effective way by a very simple expedient. He takes one *specimen day* of the Galilean ministry; and gives us the fullest record of *one day* of Jesus which is to be found in any evangelist outside the last great week.[1] What a day of work! The deep thought in the public teaching in the synagogue; the dread meeting with the powers of evil; the healing in the sick-room; the interspace for the little festival of home; the sin, sorrow, suffering, crowded before the door; the brief rest; the rising, while the dawn scarcely whitens over the desert; the refreshment of prayer; the intrusion upon that sacred solitude;[2] and then the work of preaching, pitying, helping, thinking, healing, closes in upon Him again with a circle which is at once as strong as adamant, and as light as air.[3] It is from St. Mark that we learn to estimate in some degree the divine monotony of one of those golden days of God upon earth. We learn how truly that life was a life of *toil*. But the toil was brightened by love, elevated by hope, refreshed by

[1] St. Mark i. 21–39. *Cf.* this section with its parallel in St. Luke iv. 33–44.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 22, 23; 27–30; 35; 38; 36, 37; 38.

[3] *Ibid.* 38, 39.

prayer. Its divine enthusiasm was unmarred by the peevishness of lassitude, undimmed by the mechanical respectability of routine. It was like nature which sees no wrong in necessity, and wears such splendid dreams upon its face.

The superiority of the second evangelist in occasional grasp of thought as well as in vividness of narrative comes out most remarkably in the history of the rich ruler who runs to Jesus with his question.[1] Not only are his impetuosity of action, and the fallen lowering look upon his face immediately upon the imperious and exacting word of Jesus, drawn with St. Mark's usual vivid pencil.[2] The whole real difficulty is understood with the most profound intuition, and the very words preserved by our evangelist, which turn what might otherwise be but a perplexing paradox into the deepest and most universal of spiritual truths.[3]

[1] Cf. St. Mark x. 17–31, with St. Matthew xix. 16 sqq.; St. Luke xviii. 18 sqq.

[2] ἐστυγνάκει κἀπὶ τῷ λόγῳ συκοφαντήσας εἰς καὶ γογγυσάσας κ.τ.λ. St. Mark x. 17; ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ. v. 22.

[3] Note the εἰ τὰ χρήματα ἔχουσιν (v. 23) explained by τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπὶ χρήμασι (v. 24). Observe also the protestation of the disciples' question—not "what rich man, then, can be saved?" (v. 26), but "who, then, can be saved?" (v. 26). Mark again the flood of light thrown upon the apparently hyperbolical exaggeration of the promise, by the two important words preserved in the second evangelic ἀπόφασις—παρὰ ἀνθρώπῳ (v. 30).

IV

In bringing together these sayings of our Lord or incidents in His life, which are peculiar to St. Mark's Gospel, we have no wish to evade the fact that, in the first three evangelists, there is a certain common basis of similar—or identical—sentences, words, and even formulæ.

This common element has been differently accounted for.

1. By some it has been explained on the ground that the synoptics used a common document, or documents. These, we are told, were the *Logia* or discourses, and a thin original edition of the second evangelist, the "proto-Mark," or *Ur Marcus* of certain German critics. The variations, according to some, are simply like the variations of musicians improvising on a given theme. The school of Tübingen gives them another origin. St. Matthew writes to refute St. Paul; St. Luke issues a Pauline manifesto. Incidents of the great life before which ages have bowed down and worshipped, are the misunderstood innuendos and manœuvres of "theological diplomacy." Texts which to the eyes of the weary and heavy laden, dim with tears of penitence and yearning, seem steeped in the soft light of eternal love, are rusty fragments of clumsy weapons, which were splintered centuries ago in ignoble polemical squabbles.

But there is another and much more reasonable way of accounting for these common elements, these "corpuscula evangelicae historiae." The disciples very early linked together certain portions of their Master's life, partly by the nature of the subject-matter, partly according to historical sequence. By a process of "natural elaboration" masses of this genuine Gospel tradition became rounded into a certain shape by the friction of constant repetition. As to the words of Jesus, their preservation need excite little surprise. No doubt there are discourses delivered from every pulpit of which few hearers can recall a thought, or an expression, a week after they are delivered. The painted fire of their artificial rhetoric melts away like a coloured cloud. Their correct and elegant periods leave no more trace than a child's finger on the tide over which he floats. But there are other discourses which few hearers can totally forget, and which some could reproduce years afterwards. They contain true "semina eternitatis." They grasp the whole moral and rational nature. They charm the imagination by throwing exquisite lights upon homely places, whose marvellous capacities of beauty we never suspected. They win the child's heart within the man by a pathos which appeals to "thoughts that lie too deep for tears." They subdue the conscience, because they are the expression of an eternal law.

They lay hold on the intellect by the exact correspondence between the idea and its investiture of words. They fasten themselves on the memory by that unaffected method, which is simply the apt distribution of a number of topics that may be referred to a common centre. Such, above all, were the words of Jesus—"the words that I speak unto you," He said, "they are spirit, and they are life." And the voice of sixty Christian generations answers—"Thou hast the words of eternal life." It is vain then to ask whether St. Matthew copied from St. Luke, or St. Luke from St. Matthew; whether Matthew is the "primitive" of Mark, or Mark of Matthew. Even without taking into account the promise of the Spirit to "bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever He had said unto them," such words from such a teacher could never completely perish from the earth.

But however this question of the origin of the common element in the synoptics is to be decided, the words and works of Christ, which have been preserved by St. Mark alone, are sufficiently numerous and significant to prove that he is not merely a mechanical epitomiser of St. Matthew's Gospel. If he sometimes appears as an abbreviator, he not seldom amplifies or even explains. He contributes his own proportion to the thoughts which are the life of Christendom. He brings out

Leading Ideas which give a loftier elevation to the work and Person of the Son of God.

Nor need we hesitate to say that there are entire incidents, and groups of incidents, in which the second evangelist proves himself to be almost on a higher level than the others. (1) The wonderful section (comprising the retreat of the Apostles, the compassion of Jesus for the multitudes, the feeding of the five thousand, the lonely prayer of Jesus on the mountain, the walking upon the sea, the acts of miraculous benevolence in the country beyond) is drawn by St. Mark with unsurpassed grandeur. It is written with the repressed admiration of a half-hushed awe; it is not only vivid but majestic and sustained — yet with a majesty which is softened by a sense of the compassion and of the watchful help of Jesus.[1]

(2) It has already been shown that when we compare the narratives of the rich young man in the synoptics we find St. Mark's not only touched with superior vividness, but pervaded by a superior penetration. The key to a real understanding of the whole incident is supplied by the second evangelist.[2]

[1] Cf. St. Mark vi. 34-56, with St. Matthew xiv. 13-36; St. John vi. 1-22 (St. Luke ix. 10-18, does not admit of full comparison with these parallels).

[2] Cf. St. Mark x. 17-32 (esp. v. 21-24, 28-32), with St. Matthew xix. 16-30; St. Luke xviii. 18-31.

V

There are some practical lessons which may profitably close this discussion.

1. To an age and to men resembling those whom the second evangelist addressed, in being partly material, partly sceptical, appreciating keenly, however, that which is effective, Christ should be preached, with strong, grave, plain, manly, historical simplicity. We should follow St. Mark, as he lifts up his finger and points to a long succession of trophies over human misery and sin; to that glorious compassion which raised those who were fallen upon the field of life; to the sufferer dying, as one of old said, "so lordly"; to the victor at God's right hand, Whose mighty presence is with His Church, and enables her to fill the earth with the spirit of His words and the continuation of His works. There may be something beyond evidences of Christianity in the self-evidence of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

2. The second lesson which may be drawn from our survey is a theological one.

The text, and indeed the whole of St. Mark, shows us what the Gospel is.

The word Gospel occurs in the New Testament more than seventy times.[1] The underlying idea is always glad news, or joyful annunciation. A com-

[1] As verb or substantive.

mon view of hearing the Gospel is this. A man has been so unhappy as never to have listened to a faithful preacher up to a certain time. Then first he hears of God's eternal purpose, of an effectual calling by His Spirit working in due season, of conversion, of assurance, of perseverance. He feels uplifted from the lower earth, and set upon the rock that is higher than man. He cries aloud with joy. He is safe, because he knows that he is safe.

Now let us not be misunderstood. We will not speak lightly of statements, some of which are not only the stay and comfort of loving hearts, but eternally true, while others are only exaggerations of blessed and eternal truths. But be they true or be they false, or partly true and partly false or exaggerated, yet, as a matter of fact, they are not the Gospel—not that which the New Testament calls the Gospel. For the New Testament Gospel is this. The glad news that for us sinners, and for our salvation, the Word of God has taken the Manhood into God; taken the body framed and moulded by the Spirit, to be the meet habitation of the Word; for us come upon earth; for us lived; for us wrought miracles; for us died; for us broken the prison-bars of the tomb; for us ascended; for us sent down the Holy Ghost.

We might appeal to the opening of the Epistle to the Romans; to the almost formal definition in the beginning of the fifteenth chapter of the

First Epistle to the Corinthians;[1] to the structure and character of the four Gospels. But we need little proof beyond our motto. The word is a favourite with St. Mark. In commenting upon the opening verse Bengel observes that "the *beginning* of the Gospel is in the Baptist, the *Gospel* in the whole book." But what Gospel? Simply the events from the Baptism of Jesus to His Death and Ascension.

Now, if this be the true idea of the Gospel, let us be assured that the Church preaches not this or that fragment of it, but the whole fully and unceasingly. By her great days of observance, by the Christian seasons, we have a living, permanent, continuous preaching of the Gospel, as St. Mark understood the word, taken up into the structure and texture of our lives, diffused round the circling year, emphasized by the festivities of home, borne into our hearts with the chiming of the parish church-bells. And this is reinforced by a daily recounting in the creed of those facts which are the Gospel, and by our daily and Eucharistic worship.

3. We may learn, supremely and above all, a lesson upon the conception which we are to form of Jesus.

His figure stands out from this short book. It is throughout the Gospel of Jesus, the Son of God.

[1] Rom. i. 2, 3, 4; 1 Cor. xv. 1–9.

A man must be holy to comprehend the holiness of Jesus.

Let us suppose the case of a sharp man, who has neither taste nor genius, standing before a great picture; he will point out flaw after flaw in Raphael. Place one who has neither musical appreciation, nor modesty to admit it, where he must hear Beethoven. It is an unmeaning noise, which gives him a headache. Even so, the lower the moral and spiritual life may be, the less is Jesus understood and loved. To an easy, soft-mannered, hard-hearted man of the world; to a subtle, bitter, selfish scholar, with the delicate intellectual egotism, and the fatal gift of analysis *à outrance*, Gethsemane and the cross may be a scandal or a mockery. The Gospel, which seems so poor and pale when we rise from the songs of poets and the reasonings of philosophers, is a test of our spirit. Let some ambitious students in philosophy—some who have been communing for hours with the immortal masters of history, charmed with the balanced masses and adjusted perspectives of the composition, speak out their mind plainly upon this writing of St. Mark. They will not place it very high upon their list. But let them turn to it to-morrow, when the end of their toil finds them disappointed men; when sorrow visits them; when as they put their hand upon the wall of their room, memory, like a serpent, starts out and strikes them.

Then they will recognize the infinite strength and infinite compassion of Jesus. Out of their weakness and misery, out of their disappointment, they will feel that here they can trust in a nobility that is never marred, and rest that tired heart of theirs upon a love that never fails, in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.

On the whole, then, in St. Mark we have not so much as in St. Matthew, the point of convergence of the prophetic rays in the Messiah, the Son of Abraham and David. Not so much as in St. Luke, the fairest of the children of men, Priest and victim, the teacher of grace and forgiveness. Not so much as in St. John, the Word made Flesh, floating in a robe of heavenly light. It is the Gospel whose emblem is the lion, whose Hero is full of divine love and divine strength. It is the history of Jesus which was addressed to the Romans to free them from the misery of scepticism, from the grinding dominion of iron superhuman force unguided by a loving will. Here, brief as it is, we have, in its essential germs, all the theology of the Church. Had every other part of the New Testament perished, Christendom might have been developed from this. A man's faith does not consist of the many things which he affects to believe or finds it useful to believe, but of the few things which he really believes, and with which he stands, fronting his own soul and eternity. This faith in the Gospel

of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is sufficient. Let us hold it fast, and we shall find the power of one of our Lord's promises which is peculiar to St. Mark. If we are called upon to "handle the serpents" or "to drink the deadly things"[1] of science and philosophy, we shall lift up the serpent as a standard of victory. The cup of poison shall not reach our heart as it reached the heart of Socrates, when the sun was going down behind the hill tops. "It shall not hurt you." Let us hold fast this Gospel in that which tries many who are undisturbed by speculative doubt—in conscious sinfulness, in the allurements of lust. Let us cling to it in the din of voices that fill a Church distracted by party-cries; and "He who has instructed His Church by the heavenly doctrine of His evangelist St. Mark, will grant that, being not like children carried away by every blast of vain doctrine, we shall be established in the truth of His holy Gospel." For the Church's summary of the essence of the second Gospel is that it is a Gospel which gives *strength*.

[1] St. Mark xvi. 18. [It is not, of course, intended to imply in a previous note that the mention of our Lord's *wandering in Jewrie* to St. Mark. (See Matt. viii. 19; Luke vii. 9.)]

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

A

FROM THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF HIS LIFE

"The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."
—ST. LUKE xix. 10.

I

IT will be most convenient to begin by considering what we know of the circumstances of St. Luke's life, certainly, or at least with a high degree of probability.

It is practically certain that the third evangelist was a *Gentile*.[1] It is abundantly proved that he

[1] The name Λουκᾶς, Lucas (contracted from Lucanus) points to a Gentile origin. (It must not be confounded with Λούκιος, Acts xiii. 1; Romans xvi. 21, one of St. Paul's three kinsmen.) St. Paul's words in one of the Epistles of the Captivity prove that Luke was a Gentile. "Aristarchus, Marcus, Jesus which is called Justus, who are from the circumcision." (οἱ ὄντες ἐκ περιτομῆς =

was in long and intimate relation with St. Paul,[1] not only on his missionary voyages, but at other times.[2] He was a physician, and had been in close connection of some kind with a distinguished Gentile, by name Theophilus.[3] The fact is worthy of note. The Jews "were put in trust with the oracles of God"; [4] and through Jews (with the Hebrew Christian converts from Judaism.) These three names of one class are followed by three of a different class (*i.e.* non-Hebrew Christians—Epaphras, Luke, and Demas. (Colossians iv. 12-14).

[1] This appears (though of course not exclusively) from the manuscript of St. Paul's journey in the Acts. In this book every reader is struck with the first person plural (*we*) so often repeated (first in Acts xvi. 10. *Cf.* the repeated first persons plural, down to κατέβημεν εἰς Τρωάδα, with the abrupt and abnormal οἴκαδε ἀφίεμαι, πρακτέον ἔφη, οἴκαδε ἀφικόμεθα. Acts xxi. 7, 8, with *ibid.* ver. 10, 11.) Of course it has been neglected by some critics, who, in the name of plain common-sense, weave theories of superhuman subtlety; and it is, therefore, equally of course, now a *fact* required by *science* (according to the same critics) that this and other passages presenting the same peculiarity are fragments of a narrative of some other companion of the Apostle, translated by St. Luke—and that they, therefore, contain no proof that the evangelist ever made these voyages in person. Ours is certainly the natural view. There is no proof, however, that St. Luke was converted by St. Paul, who never calls him "his son."

[2] Colossians iv. 14; Philemon 24. It is interesting to observe that the two evangelists, Mark and Luke, are mentioned in the context of both passages (Colossians iv. 14, *cf.* v. 10; Philemon 24) "*Marcus*, Aristarchus, Demas, *Lucas*," on which St. Chrysostom quickly remarks, "(the last is much-the-last"). See also—"only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee." 2 Timothy iv. 11.

[3] Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρός. Colossians iv. 14; πρέσβυς οἰκέτας. St. Luke i. 54; *cf.* Acts i.

[4] Romans iii. 2.

great exception of the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles) they were perhaps all delivered.

Other circumstances emerge from the darkness with a very high degree of probability. The narrative in the Acts of the Apostles exactly agrees in tone with the ancient tradition that St. Luke belonged originally to Antioch. The author of that work evidently enjoyed peculiar sources of information about the city; and we can feel the glow of a patriotic townsman in the subdued triumph of the tone in which he writes—"the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch."[1] That St. Paul's apostolic authority, and consummate mastery in the magnificent universalism of the Faith, presided over the formation of the third Gospel, and guided its estimate and Leading Ideas of the life and work of Jesus, is not only attested by ancient authority, but is in entire accordance with the language of both writers and with their conceptions of Christ and of Christianity.[2]

[1] Acts xi. 26. See the whole passage from v. 22 to the close of the chapter. A reading of Acts xi. 28 is found in Codex D.—ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις συνήγαγον δὲ ἅπαν ἐκκλησίαν κδ, κ. τ. λ. (συνήγαγον = to gather together, is in Acts x. 41 ; xxvii. 33). This reading is adopted by St. Augustine. (*De Serm. Dom.* ii. 57.) The widely accepted statement that St. Luke was of Antioch first found, probably, in Eusch. *H. E.* iii. 4). Ewald supposes to have arisen from this reading of Acts xi. 28. (Ewald. *Apostelgeschichte*, 3ª ed. ; 259 sqq.)

[2] It seems singular that the mention of St. Luke by St. Paul in

What are we to think of the long-received supposition that St. Luke was a personal disciple of Jesus?

That he was so from the beginning of our Lord's Ministry is absolutely contradicted, not only by other circumstances just mentioned, but by the evangelist's own language in the forefront of his Gospel. He distinguishes himself modestly and precisely from those "which *from the beginning* were eye-witnesses."[1]

Yet unquestionably from early times there was a widespread tradition that St. Luke was a personal follower of Jesus—indeed one of the seventy disciples; and this is indicated by the Gospel appointed for St. Luke the Evangelist's Day.[2]

What if the writer of the third Gospel was in a limited degree "an eye-witness,"[3] but not "*from the beginning*"?—*i.e.* in a certain sense a disciple of Jesus, though not one of the original disciples?

There is one passage which seems to give considerable support to this view. It is the narrative

2 Timothy iv. 11—evidently for a somewhat prolonged sojourn (μετάλαβε περὶ χεῖμῶνα ἔλθειν. *ibid.* v. 21)—has been so little associated with "the books and especially the parchments," (τὰς βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας. *ibid.* v. 13.) The passage really seems to point to some sort of literary collaboration between Luke on Mark and the Apostle. But the character of the third Gospel, and the witness of antiquity, prove that if such collaboration existed it was between Luke (not Mark) and Paul.

[1] St. Luke i. 2, 3.

[2] St. Luke x. 1 *sqq.*

[3] αὐτόπται. St. Luke i. 2.

[4] ἐκ ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται. *ibid.*

of the appearance of the Risen Lord to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus.[1] The whole section is touched with St. Luke's softest and tenderest pencil. It is characterized throughout by an indescribable sweetness, fulness, familiarity, majesty.[2] How is it possible that it could have been written by any but by an eye-witness? The whole company of simple men who at that time followed Jesus could not have supplied an

[1] St. Luke xxiv. 13-36.

[2] "The Inns on the two disciples going to Emmaus in 'Continuation,' though little more than a paraphrase of the Gospel narrative, convey pleasantly the evangelical idea of the Divine Friend. Cowper says in one of his letters that he had been intimate with a man of the taste, who had confessed to him that though he could not subscribe to the truth of Christianity itself, he could never read this passage of St. Luke without being deeply affected by it, and feeling that if the stamp of divinity was impressed upon anything in the Scriptures, it was upon that passage."—*Cowper*, by Goldwin Smith, in Macmillan's *Men of Letters*, p. 54.

"It was almost exclusively owing to his mother that Schiller's religious feeling, his tender sense of all that was good and beautiful, his love of mankind, tolerance and capacity of self-sacrifice, in the circle of his sisters and companions, distinguished him boy.

"On Sunday afternoon when she went to walk with both the children, she was wont to explain to them the Church gospel for the day. 'Once,' so stands it in Christopher's Memorials, 'when we two, as children, had set out walking with dear mamma to see our grandparent, she took the way from Ludwigsburg to Marbach, which leads straight over the hill. It was a beautiful Easter Monday, and our mother related to us the history of the two disciples to whom, on their journey to Emmaus, Jesus had joined himself. Her speech and narrative grew ever more inspired; and when we got upon the hill we were all so much affected that we knelt down and prayed. This hill became a Tabor to us.'"—*Carlyle's Life of Schiller*, p. 226.

author who would have been at home with the conception of a risen God. If Gaillet had had at that time some mute Inglorious Shakespeare, even *Ad* genius would have been unable to move with freedom in these altitudes of the imagination. Who but a disciple, and a disciple who was present, could have known so much, not only about Jesus but about the two—how they *felt* as well as how they walked and talked? It may, of course, be suggested that St. Luke here (as, no doubt, upon other occasions) used documents which were supplied to him for his work—and the suggestion cannot be considered as in itself unreasonable. But there are two points which deserve consideration. (1) There is something remarkable in the evangelist's mention of the name of one of the disciples—"the one of them, whose name was Cleopas." Why is the other not directly named? It is quite of a piece with the lofty and tender reserve of St. John, who so often speaks of himself allusively.[1] (2) One of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus has a *Greek* name.[2] This lends

[1] St. John xiii. 23; xviii. 15; xix. 27; xx. 2, 3, 4, 8; xxi. 7-20. It would appear as if this were a principle common to all the evangelists. Contrast St. Matthew's zealously reserved account of his call (St. Matthew ix. 9-14) with St. Mark ii. 15 sqq.; St. Luke v. 29 sqq. St. Mark seems to indicate himself in St. Mark xiv. 51 (an incident psychologically quite on the same line with the rest of St. Mark's character in Acts xv. 37).

[2] Κλέοπας is contracted from Κλεόπατρος. The Cleopas in St. Luke's Gospel is erroneously identified in the margin A.V. with the

some additional probability to his companion being of the same origin.[1]

II

What, then, to a man like St. Luke would be the great Leading Idea of a narrative of the Life of Jesus—suggested by the circumstances of his own life? Surely it would be the following.

Christ rose in the midst of a people the "most strikingly individualized" amongst the nations of the earth—a people narrow in their conception of humanity, and intensely bigoted in the ritual of their creed. Yet (except in unessential particulars) little about Him spoke of one race or of one time. This man of an *individualized* race presents the type and model of a *universalized* humanity.

It is not very easy for us to place ourselves adequately in the position to estimate this. It has become a facile affectation to talk of the brotherhood of Man. Our large opportunities of travel-

"Cleophas" of St. John xix. 25. The latter should be given as *Clopas*, which is one transliteration of the Aramaic name חלפא of which Ἀλφαῖος is another. See Mill. *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, 228, 229. Bretschn. *Man. N.T.* 248 *b*.

[1] We may associate the presence of these disciples with the Ἔκκλησία κύριε (St. John xxi. 20). It may be added that those who take pleasure in the thought of connecting St. Luke in some way with the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews—a connection of which there are numerous indications—will love to trace its marvellous hermeneutics to the great Interpreter. (διερμηνευόμενος κύριε ὁ ἐν ἡ ἡμέρᾳ τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. St. Luke xxiv. 27.)

ling, and the tendency of modern education, which make it (as Arnold said) only "less disgraceful to be ignorant of foreign literature than of our own," contribute powerfully to this. Only those who are already old can now remember the days when steamboats were few and small, and, except in England, railways did not exist. When the boyish traveller crossed the narrow sea to Calais, even a Frenchman seemed to him a being of almost a different nature. He would, perhaps, have been a little perplexed to be told that the Frenchman was a fellow-man and a fellow-Christian.

But, in the case of our Lord, there was a man apparently of low position and of narrow training. He had never travelled in foreign lands, or been rocked upon the great sea. He was of Jewish blood and antecedents, possibly with certain outward Jewish characteristics; certainly of Jewish training and surroundings.[1] Yet He loves, pities, honours, man as man. He can, indeed, feel indignation, generally an indignation interfused with grief. Of contempt He scarcely seems capable; unless we so except those few occasions when men appeared to have allowed their God-given endowments to sink to the level of the mere animal creation—of dog or swine, of viper or fox.[2] He

[1] Certain traits of accent or of appearance may have led to the question of the woman of Samaria—"how is it that thou, being a Jew?" (St. John iv. 9.)

[2] St. Matthew vii. 6; xii. 34. St. Luke xiii. 32.

is pitiful and pure—pitiful in proportion to His purity. And hence that ear, so exquisitely sensitive to the discords of sin, is the first that ever heard the one faint pulse which yet kept time and tune in the harlot's passionate heart. At times He looks right over all seas and distances. He knows that His voice is of infinite volume, and that He can throw it where He will. He speaks with divine, impartial pity to all sinners and sorrowers. And in the days when He is to be absent, the message of a universal love and pity is to be carried into all lands at all costs—"both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."[1]

This view of the character and work of Jesus was naturally attractive to a man of St. Luke's antecedents. His Leading Idea of our Lord was naturally that of the universal Saviour. From memoirs in the possession of original eye-witnesses, their friends and families; from living traditions of living men and women; from the teaching and personal influence of St. Paul; as we think in the highest degree probable, partly from his own personal recollection, the third evangelist, under the guidance of the Spirit of Christ, described the Lord Jesus as such a man would love to contemplate the Head of our common humanity. In His cradle, in His miracles, in His words, in His sufferings, in His

[1] Acts i. 8.

cross, in His glory, He was the light of the world, the light of the Gentiles. That which He said of a fallen son of Abraham is equally true of a fallen race. "The Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." The Gospel according to St. Luke is in its Leading Idea the Gospel of fallen humanity.

St. Luke was not only "capable of forming such an idea"—he was actually possessed by it. He knew of Athens, its agora, its great sects of philosophers, its peculiar institutions.[1] He reports St. Paul's lofty ethnological teaching upon the unity of the human race. He understands from his master the influence of climate and geographical position upon the destinies of race. The crises of national development, and the boundaries shaped out by the course of events, supply him with the keys to human history.[2] He was fitted by all the conditions of his position and modes of thought to perceive that the mission of Jesus was a universal call, with two necessary correlatives—universally impending judgment, and the universally intelligible witness of a Divine Being manifested in a human life and death.[3]

[1] Acts xvii. 26.

[2] ἀρέσκει πρωϊαγορεύουσιν κυρίοις καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν κατοικίας κάνοῦν. Acts xvii. 26.

[3] ἐ θεὸς τὰ νῦν παραγγέλλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πᾶσι, πανταχοῦ μετανοεῖν. ἐστησεν ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην—πίστιν παρεχων πᾶσι, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. Acts xvii. 30, 31.

This Gentile evangelist, possibly writing his Gospel from Rome, the capital of the Gentile world, and impressed with the rejection of the Jews, brings before us the Gospel as the Gospel of humanity, the Saviour as the Saviour of the world. "It forms," says Schenkel, "the Gentile-Christian antithesis to the Jewish Christian thesis in the evangelical history, and it aims at giving Christianity an universal significance." "According to the preface, it is a composition intended to confirm the faith of a distinguished Gentile catechumen in evangelical truth." Born in a stable, under the Roman Emperor, He who was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary is the Saviour of all men. His genealogy is brought up to Adam, the head of our humanity, not to Abraham, the progenitor of the Jewish people.[1] While St. Matthew speaks chiefly of the Twelve as representatives of the twelve tribes, St. Luke lays more stress upon the sending of the Seventy, that number being the symbol of the nations under the theocracy.[2] The great episode of the so-called "Journey Report"[3] mentions a journey through Samaria to Judæa and Jerusalem. We may note in it tenderness to the Samaritans, in refusing to bring down fire from heaven,[4] and in choosing the Samaritan as the embodiment of charity in that

[1] St. Luke iii. 38.
[2] *Ibid.* ix. 51; xviii. 30.
[3] *Cf.* St. Luke ix. 1, 6; x. 1, 20.
[4] *Ibid.* ix. 51, 56.

story[1] whose beauty has never been exceeded but by another, "of which Jesus is not the narrator but the subject." We may also observe that breathing of deathless hope over Tyre and Sidon—"if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon, which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented."[2] And, above all, the parables of the Lost Sheep and the Prodigal Son, which touch upon the exile and the return of God's self-banished children with such tender and tearful love.[3]

As a natural consequence of this, one of the

[1] St. Luke x. 30, 37. [2] *Ibid.* ver. 13.

[3] It is interesting to trace some of the apparently minute modifications in the language of a Gospel to its source in a Leading Idea. (1) In the parable from nature of the reaping summer, the two other *synoptics* have—"from a parable of the *figtree*"—St. Matthew xxiv. 36; St. Mark xiii. 28. But St. Luke from other sources of information adds, "the fig-tree *and all the trees*." (St. Luke xxi. 29.) There was some influence which wanted like that the addition might be needed for readers in other regions who do not know what the nature of the fig-tree is. (2) In St. Matthew we read of ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν about thirty-two times; in St. Luke this never occurs, but ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ thirty-three times. We may conjecture that there was some fear of encouraging a material and local view. Yet *ἀρχαὶ* itself is a very favourite word of St. Luke's. The question became one of transcendent importance for the Jewish missionaries in China in the last century. (3) It has from an early period been remarked that there is an intensive reason which holds back St. Luke (the evangelist of the Gentiles) from employing in the narrative of the Transfiguration the word which might suggest the *metamorphosis* of heathen theology (Cf. μεταμορφοῦν, St. Matthew xvii. 2) St. Mark ix. 2, with ἐφάνετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, κ.τ.λ. St. Luke ix. 29.)

great Leading Ideas of St. Luke's Gospel is also the Leading Idea of St Paul; which, therefore, he did not develop from any other source than the life and words of Christ. That Leading Idea is forgiveness, grace—"not grace from works, but works from grace."

This is throughout a fundamental conception of St. Luke in those parts which are peculiar to him. All is Christ's gift. So is it with the lower blessing of healing. "On many that were blind He *bestowed* sight."[1] So much more is it with the higher gift of pardon and peace. Does not this apply to the story of the sinful woman who anointed the feet of Jesus; to the parables of the love of God the Son in seeking the lost, and of God the Father in going to meet the prodigal, when he is yet a great way off?[2] Consider, again, the parable of the Pharisee and Publican,[3] probably not recorded by St. Matthew, because *he* might be supposed to be the Publican from whom it was drawn. In an age which must have outrageous excitement, people run after the converted prize-fighter, or to hear the life, babbled out in a sermon, of some poor sinner with the rouge scarcely washed from her faded face. So was it not with St. Augustine in his *Confessions*, where the mother of his lost Adeodatus passes into

[1] So the R.V. well translates ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν. St. Luke vii. 21.

[2] St. Luke xv. 36 *sqq.* | xv.

[3] *Ibid.* xviii. 10 *sqq.*

the silence, veiled and tearful, a shadow without a name. So was it not with Apostles. The same thought appears in section after section. We shall at once remember Zaccheus, to whose home salvation comes, for the Son of Man came to seek and to save that which was lost; the look that recalled Peter to himself; the word from the cross, preserved by St. Luke alone—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do;" the other word to the dying thief, who believed that in the pierced hands lay the keys of death and hell—to-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise;" the commission that "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."[1]

This Gospel, whose key-note and leading idea is forgiveness; which has, as its own peculiar treasures, the forgiveness of the fallen woman, of the publican, of the crucifiers, of the dying thief, of a world if that world will receive it; comes well from the Gentile evangelist, the friend of St. Paul the great doctor of grace, who wrote his Gospel under St. Paul's guidance[2] and encouragement. There are

[1] St. Luke xix. 9, 10; xxiii. 61; xxiii. 34, 43; xxiv. 47.

[2] Let us here draw attention to some important traces of Pauline thought and language in the third Gospel.

(a) One of the most interesting passages in the New Testament is the account of the institution of the Holy Communion, in the 11th chapter of 1st Corinthians. It contains the earliest record of the Eucharist, the earliest written words of our Lord. We find a

two great sub-sections of this Leading Idea of the Gentile Gospel which remain to be indicated.

(*a*) The rejection of the Jews and the fall of Jerusalem form the antithesis to this call of the Gentiles. Yet, abused as it may have been by fanaticism, the hope of the restoration of Israel is in accordance with Scripture. Jerusalem is dear to every man of the race of Israel. The celebrated writer who is accused by his enemies of metaphysical glitter, of exaggerated tinsel and affected antithesis, becomes serious when he speaks of her. His de-

remarkable coincidences with this in St. Luke's narrative, more especially in one point. St. Matthew and St. Mark say of the herald, οὗτος γάρ ἐστι ὁ εἰρηκὼς κτλ. St. Luke alone says of the herald, εἰρηκότος, and in this he coincides with St. Paul.[1]

(*b*) Few words are more familiar to all students than χάρις and πίστις. Χάρις occurs about 146 times in the New Testament, only on 21 occasions outside St. Paul's and St. Luke's writings; πίστις is found in some 243 places, about 53 times outside St. Paul and St. Luke.

(*c*) All readers of St. Paul's Epistles must have been struck by the contrast drawn in Romans v. and 1 Corinthians xv. between the first man, who is from the earth, of dust, and the Second Man, whose origin is from heaven.* In not the given of this phrase lies perhaps in the last clause of the genealogy in St. Luke—"which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God" (St. Luke iii. 38).

[1] St. Matthew xxvi. 26, 27, λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον, καὶ εὐλογήσας... λαβὼν τὸν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας. So St. Mark xiv. 22, 23. But in St. Luke xxii. 19, 20, λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας κ.τ.λ. *Cf.* 1 Corinthians xi. 24, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν.

* ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, Genesis ii. 7; ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. See Tischendorf and Reiche, *Comm. Crit.* 1 Corinthians xv. 47.

scription of Jerusalem is drawn with the pencil of a genuine enthusiasm. We feel that the anticipation of prophecy elevates his style when he rejoices in the fact that the terraced gardens are again ascending the hills of Jerusalem; that "the true children of the land, the vine and the olive," are again exulting in their native soil.[1] The thought of Israel's restoration is in the words, preserved by St. Luke—"they shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."[2]

St. Paul's magnificent prophecy is but the expansion of these divine words.[3]

(*b*) A second subsection of this great chapter of St. Luke's Leading Idea of his Gospel as the Gentile Gospel is the prominence assigned to *prayer* in it. In the classics, the Greek and Roman writers are seldom quite serious in their treatment of prayer. The "psalmist of Eleusis"[4] gives an account of the origin of its mysteries in lines intended to be used in devotion, which are splendid with the colouring of Homer, but can never have expressed a sigh or accompanied a tear. For anything like a real liturgy we must pass from Greece and Rome to Egypt. But the Jews had an unapproachable

[1] Lord Beaconsfield's *Tancred*.

[2] St. Luke xxi. 24.

[3] Romans xi. 11–29 (especially v. 25).

[4] Mr. Gore's expression for the author of the hymn εἰς Δήμητραν.

prayer-book in the Psalter, with its sweet yet awful conception of the intercourse of the spirit of man with the Spirit of God.[1]

An exemplar of the *example* and of the *duty* of *prayer* would, consequently, be within the scope of this Leading Idea of the Gentile Evangelist.[2] Of the praying Christ Himself in St. Luke, we shall have to speak in another place. Twice the Saviour, in St. Luke, specially urges His followers to prayer. Three parables—one among the simplest and homelicst of all;[3] another summing up the whole widowed life of the Church in her life of prayer;[4] a third more nearly than any other approaching to the caustic sarcasm of a divine irony[5]—are found in this Gospel alone.

[1] See especially Ps. xxvii. 8, xxxii. 5, xxxiv. 6. The popular Greek notion of prayer to the dead century before Christ presents a strange contrast as drawn from the life in the newly found Mimes of Herondas. IV. pp. 14-18 (copies. Brun. 79-95). Rutherford's Edit.

[2] St. Luke xviii. 1; xxi. 36.

[3] The parable of the friend who goes to borrow three loaves, St. Luke xi. 5-14. Additional emphasis is lent to the parable by the place in which it occurs, just after the close of the Saviour's solemn prayer, and by His giving the Lord's Prayer in answer to the request, "Lord, teach us to pray." (St. Luke xi. 11.)

[4] St. Luke xviii. 1-9.

[5] St. Luke xviii. 9-15, ἐ θαρισαίω σεαυτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηύχετο (v. 11). We are not to connect πρὸς ἑαυτὸν with σεαυτὸν (which, as Meyer shows, would have required καθ' ἑαυτόν), but with προσηύχετο so "he prayed these things with" (almost εἰς or ἐν ἑαυτοῦ understood) "himself." "Prayed these things," but what things? Not one word, one sigh, one thought of prayer. It was glorification addressed to self, not prayer addressed to God. The two parables

III

We may draw two lessons from this part of our subject.

1. The first is that St. Luke's Leading Idea of Christ as the Saviour of universal humanity is the very life of the hope without which missionary work must die out of the world.

The unvarnished history told by some honest traveller has often more power to awaken us to a sense of our duty towards the heathen than missionary sermons—nay, than the appeals of missionaries themselves.

The hatred, cruelty, drunkenness, lust, prevalent in some tribes; the very food with its stench of death; the boat-loads of stupefied wretches carried down the Congo to be eaten, shame us into thought. Human nature seems to be outraged in its majesty, and cries—"do something to raise these abject creatures."

What that something is to be we learn supremely from the third Gospel. The needle of the human heart trembles towards the ideal made real in Jesus. This gives manhood to man, and makes the woman feel that she is a woman. Conscience and pity awaken to the simple presentation of the like-

(viii. 1-15) are an instance of the balance by contrast in which St. Luke so much delights in every part of his work; (viii. 1, 9, *how to pray*; xviii. 9-15, *how not to pray*.

ness of the Son of Man. As His work is brought home the soul springs forward and hails the light of duty, as the bird upon the hill-side, when the sunshine begins to scatter the frost-mist, claps his wing, and salutes the light with a cry of gladness. The splendid motto of successful missionary work is in St. Luke's verse, quivering and radiant with the sunshine of the victory of heaven. "There was great joy in that city."[1] The universal Saviour of St. Luke's Leading Idea is fitted for every human heart.

2. For the same reason the Jesus of St. Luke's delineation is fitted to raise up and renovate those who are called "failures" among ourselves.

Many people know some young soul once bright and elastic, who went down in the morning singing to the battle of life, as if destined to become a leader in the army. In the noontide he stands before them cowed and helpless. He is now like a broken blade in the battle, or a shivered lamp in the sanctuary. "I seemed so strong and likely," he tells you. "But you see what I am." Then with a tear or with a sneer—or with both simultaneously—"I am one of 'Bishop Butler's favourites';[2] I am a Failure!"

From time to time the Jesus of whom St. Luke tells us manifests Himself to such as these. This

[1] Acts viii. 8.

[2] Bishop Butler, *Analogy*. Part I., chap. ii. *ad fin.*

Jesus of every man, and therefore of each man, seeks before He saves, seeks first and saves afterwards—this tender Jesus, with the tears of the sinful woman raining down upon His feet; this *pathetic* Jesus[1] Who suffered on earth, and suffers along the ages, Whose pity is so wonderful and so creative. Is it not actually a Leading Idea of St. Luke's Gospel that there need necessarily be no final failures—for out of the failures of earth are wrought the successes of heaven? "The Son of Man came to seek and save that which is lost."

[1] εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός. Acts xxvi. 23 (*passibilis*).

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

B

FROM HIS SPECIAL TRAINING

"Luke, the beloved physician."—COLOSSIANS iv. 14.

ST. LUKE was a physician. It was from the first subtly remarked that his professional bias might be inferred from the whole tone in which he speaks of medical practitioners as contrasted with St. Mark. In the case of the woman with the issue of blood the third evangelist records, indeed, the failure of all treatment. But he also hints that she belonged to the class of patients who, if poor, necessarily incur a ruinous expenditure, while they are fatally bound to disappointment from the want of the necessary conditions for successful treatment. St. Mark's language is fuller, and not without a touch of something of almost melancholy bitterness

—a suppressed pathos almost passing into censure. He tells with a sigh which we can all but hear the concentrated experience of the sick of all ages—not only the expense of treatment and the failure to cure, but the hopeless and heart-breaking diversity of opinion, the cruel suffering, the actual injury done by tentative remedies.[1] The passage in the third Gospel (even in its unaltered form) is evidently consistent, that in the second Gospel as evidently inconsistent with a physician's instinctive estimate of his own profession.

I

We proceed to inquire what bearing St. Luke's special training has upon the Leading Ideas of his Gospel.

1. It has a *direct bearing* upon these. Mention has *five* special miracles of healing are peculiar to

[1] ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν πεπονθυῖα καὶ τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν πάντα καὶ δαπανήσασα τὸν βίον καὶ ὠφεληθεῖσα οὐδὲν ἀμείνονι διέκειτο. St. Luke viii. 43; the aor. ὠφεληθεῖσα is surely much more emphatic than "could not be healed" of our two versions. It indicates the lack of vital energy in the patient. (The words from ἰατρῶν to αὐτῶν, both included, are omitted by two uncials A.D. With this reading the thought would simply be that the woman was one of the class of patients whose case, from its intrinsic conditions, did not admit of successful treatment.") Contrast St. Mark's language—πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα. St. Mark v. 26.

St. Luke.[1] The last of these is worthy of special notice. The *latest* miracle of healing in the long series of the Good Physician's acts of benevolence is surely suitable to the physician's Gospel.[2]

St. Luke, as a physician, belonged to the "lettered class" of the Roman Empire. In Imperial Rome there was a higher college of medical studies, with examinations and exercises for degrees in which success was by no means assured to the candidate. No doubt the physician was not necessarily a gentleman of his day by birth at least. An intelligent slave sometimes won his emancipation and became a freedman for the purpose of pursuing his medical studies.[3]

[1] (1) The rising of the widow of Nain's son—St. Luke vii. 11-17. (2) The restoration of the woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years—xiii. 10-17. (3) The cure of the man with the dropsy, xiv. 1-6. (4) The cleansing of the ten lepers—xvii. 12-20. (5) The healing of the High Priest's servant, whose ear was cut off—xxii. 50, 51. Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, vi. 221, 222, English translation) contains some interesting remarks upon the whole subject of our Lord's miraculous cures.

[2] St. Luke xxii. 50, 51.

[3] It has been observed that contracted names (like *Lucas* from *Lucanus*) were common among slaves. In an example of discussion of *facti*, after the plaintiff's contention, Eighbo argues—"*servitio* eum Plauti *dominis* dedisse, *medicinam* praebitum; manumissum aliene se familiae inmiscuisse, se rogantem eis servire, emptum." (M. F. QUINTIL. *Instit. Orat.*, vii., ii. 26. Tom. iii. 63, edit. Spalding.) The commentator's assertion in a subsequent volume that "medicine" means *surgery* exclusively, is refuted by many passages in Quintilian, where the "medicus" gives prescriptions and draughts, especially by a poisoning case. (*Ibid.* vii. ii. 17.) It has been remarked that there was a considerable medical school at

Thus one Leading Idea of the third Gospel is the reality of the healings effected by Jesus, their objective character as *facts* which actually occurred within the confines of history. This reality is attested to us by their capacity for being recorded in the terms of the medical science of the day.

There is another point which may most suitably be mentioned here. There are, probably, not very many persons imbued with the modern spirit, for whom the chief difficulty in the Gospels is not the recognition of demoniacal possession by the evangelists, and (if they have not misapprehended His teaching) by our Lord Himself. It seems to be very widely assumed that not only lunacy and suicidal mania, but convulsive and epileptiform seizures are confounded with possession. It is therefore important to notice that the distinction between these two classes of affections is quite clearly indicated by St. Luke.[1] In this respect, the Gospel of the physician gives us important help.[2]

2. To the training of St. Luke's professional life developing natural aptitude we may trace, in some

Colosse. St. Paul's special mention of St. Luke as a physician with deep personal affection may not have been without reference to this fact. Christianity from the very first, for reasons deeply connected with its whole dogmatic and ethical teaching, brought the medical profession into prominence, and the Apostle desires to make it honourable. (See Bishop Westbrook, *W.T.* vol. ii. 351.)

[1] ἐκβάλλω ἐκὰ τῶν πόλεων—ἐκβαλόντες ἐκὰ τῆς πόλεως. St. Luke vi. 17, 18.

[2] See Note B at the end of this Discussion.

measure a second and very important Leading Idea of the third Gospel.

Early in that Gospel, we read of the devout Simeon saying, with the Holy Spirit upon him, to the Blessed Mother, that her wondrous "Child was set for the fall and rising up of many in Israel; and for a sign ever being spoken against: *that thoughts out of many hearts* may be revealed."[1] The revelation of human character by Christ, Christ as the touchstone of the human soul, is a second great Leading Idea of St. Luke's Gospel—and might almost stand as its summary from one point of view—and this characteristic is more closely connected with St. Luke's special training than might at first appear.

The physician is, perforce, something of a psychologist, and the physician of considerable practice has opportunities of exercising himself in the study of human nature probably accorded to no other man. Psychologizing may have peculiar dangers for natures of an introspective tendency. The psychological scoundrel occasionally admires himself as an interesting phenomenon; it is something to be a singular scoundrel. Much more frequently the student of self congratulates himself upon the acuteness of some piece of self-discovery,

[1] ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν οἱ διαλογισμοὶ ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν. St. Luke ii. 35. διαλογισμοί, διαλογισμοῖς, are truly *Lucan* words (see *Bruder Concordant*, s.v.). Thoughts too vague for present utterance are opened, and man is revealed to himself, by Christ.

when he should be amending a weakness or sighing over a sin. But the physician has an ample field in his observation of others. He comes to make a diagnosis of our malady; he goes away perhaps, with a more thorough diagnosis of our character. If we were called upon to take part in a process of canonization, we might find a more satisfactory witness in the doctor than in the confessor to the true spirituality of a man's soul. He knows in his minute and lengthened observations whether the sick man possesses patience, resignation, faith. The physician may not be a religious man. He may be a speculative unbeliever. Yet his ear is quick and his eye sharp. He knows whether the feet of Jesus have stood by the bedside, whether His voice has whispered low and sweet over the darkening waves—"it is I: be not afraid." Thus in St. Luke's Gospel we have delineations of human character as revealed by the presence of Christ. The Gospel of the *physician* is also the Gospel of the *psychologist*.[1]

[1] The same divine unifying *principle* is often to be speak translated into the languages of different tracts of thought by different Leading Ideas in two or more evangelists. There were deep and divine reasons why the Risen Saviour was not to run the risk of being seen by any miscellaneous crowd. St. Mark tells us this of the walk to Emmaus (v. 12) that—"He was manifested *ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ*" (St. Mark xvi. 12.) But St. Luke gives the *internal* and *psychological* reason—"their eyes were holden"—and the cause of this "*ἐκράτουν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν*," (St. Luke xxiv. 16-25.) Note also the preservation by our evangelist alone of the profoundly significant *καὶ ἔφαγον*, so important in the formation of character. (ix. 23.)

(*a*) We need but remind ourselves of such single characters as Herod and Pilate;[1] as the covetous man who wishes to make Christ an arbitrator: as Zaccheus.[2]

But St. Luke specially aimed at groups, or at least, pairs of contrasted characters[3]—at showing us how the thoughts of their hearts are revealed as if by an electric light at some crisis-moment suddenly thrown by the Master of their being upon each twig and fibre of the tree of the inner life. Like the other evangelists, indeed, he seldom ventures to tell in so many words the principles which lay at the root of our Lord's treatment of each case. We are left to discover that for ourselves. And the very diversity of the treatment is a key to our understanding of the character. A remarkable instance is found in the three types of different natures and conditions of men thrown together by St. Luke alone.[4] The two first, indeed, are known to us from St. Matthew.[5] But the

[1] St. Luke xxiii. 9, *cf.* ix. 9. (The writer ventures to refer to a sermon upon the character of Herod Antipas, in *The Great Question*, 2nd edit., Kegan Paul and Trench, pp. 171–183.) For the remarkable indication of Pilate's character in St. Luke v. 9, see *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 201, 202.

[2] The most wonderful of these is Barabbas and Jesus; what is said of the first, and left unsaid of the second, with the tremendous *voluntarieus* of the Jews in their persistent choice. Ἠρώτουν—αἰτοῦσιν ἀπολῦσαι (St. Luke xxiii. 25). [3] St. Luke ix. 57–62.

[4] St. Matthew viii. 18–23. To this part of the subject perhaps belongs the sacred and subtle *irony* of certain parts of our Lord's teaching. We have already noticed St. Luke xviii. 11. Again St.

addition of the third makes the purpose more emphatic. The first was willing, too willing perhaps. Probably his position as scribe, student and thinker, made a wandering life too cruel a trial for him. Possibly he could render better service among his books and natural companions. At all events, Christ reins back the willing: He drives the spur into the unwilling. For the soul's life of the two last, they must nerve themselves as if to pass through an agony of death. Indeed, it would seem as if one Leading Idea of St. Luke were to correct the most popular and prevalent fallacy of our own days—the heresy of salvation by emotion, the belief that a religion of sudden transport and sonorous affirmation is the only religion that saves. The Saviour, whom St. Luke delineates, loved to awaken neither exaggerated profession nor hasty resolution. How could He—He whose resolution had an eternity behind it, and whose work, therefore, had an eternity before it? Of Him it is supremely true, that

> "God approves
> The depth and not the transport of the soul,
> A fervent not ungovernable love."[1]

Luke xi. 36, 37. St. Luke's abiding psychological insight taught him that the lawyer would not bring himself to do such honour to the son of a despised race as to say downright, "the Samaritan." So he preserves for us the plausible ambiguity of the respectable periphrasis "*he that showed mercy on him.*"

[1] Wordsworth—*Laodamia.*

A beautiful exception is made in favour of woman's more tender and demonstrative nature.[1] But the delineation of the Saviour by the third evangelist is markedly intended to discourage the ostentatious display of unregulated emotion, so well known to us as sentimentalism. Besides one passage already quoted,[2] we find in St. Luke the sentimental woman corrected by a wholesome check upon her admiration, the sentimental man warned by a stern parable,[3] the sentimental multitude[4] sifted and chastened by the fourfold "cannot"[5] and by the three anti-sentimental parables, peculiar to our Gospel.[6] The singular gush and fulness of St. Peter's profession, and our Lord's short sad warning, in St. Luke's narrative, may close the important topic.[7]

But before leaving the subject of St. Luke's fineness and delicacy of psychological perception, we should notice those brief but most true touches which take off, as by an instantaneous photograph, those apparently contradictory co-existences of feeling which lie at the root of life in its deeper moods. It is he who tells us how St. Peter,

[1] St. Luke vii. 44-46. [5] *Ibid.* iv. 27.

[2] *Ibid.* xi. 27, 28; xiv. 15-25. [6] *Ibid.* xv.

[3] "There went with Him great multitudes," *Ibid.* xiv. 25.

[4] οἱ ὄχλοι (xiv. 26); οἱ ὄχλοι (v. 27); οἱ ὄχλοι, οἱ ὄχλοι (v. 33).

[7] The improvident builder; the improvident warrior; the king in peril (St. Luke xiv. 28-34).

[8] *Ibid.* xxii. 32, 34.

in the sweet and awful moment when Christ first reveals Himself fully to his soul as the Master of it and of nature, though he clung to that Lord with a yearning devotion before unknown, yet "fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."[1] It is St. Luke again who remembers that, when the risen Lord had showed the disciples His hands and His feet there was a space during which "they believed not for joy."[2] Perhaps the most important of these psychological *aperçus* is contained in the brief history of the Ascension. After Jesus was parted from the disciples, the third evangelist tells us that "they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem *with great joy*."[3] Now the current rationalistic account of the Ascension of our Lord is that it is an amplification of the last scene of Elijah's life, and modelled upon it. But there is one point of absolute divergence. At the parting of Elijah there are voices of anticipatory mourning; there is an exceeding bitter cry, and the rent garment of mourning.[4] But in St. Luke's account of the Ascension of Jesus there is this touch without a parallel in the long history of human partings—"with great joy." Yes! For there remained the unfading memory of the uplifted hands, and the great hope which closes the Ascension narrative.[5]

[1] St. Luke v. 8, 9. [2] *Ibid.* xxiv. 41.
[3] *Ibid.* xxiv. 52. [4] 2 Kings ii. 3-13. [5] Acts i. 11.

(*b*) This Leading Idea of St. Luke's Gospel finds one of its richest applications in its development of the character of *women* in relation to Jesus. The third Gospel tells us with unrivalled delicacy and fullness what Jesus did for woman,[1] and what woman did for Jesus. It is the Gospel of womanhood become Christian, or on its way to Christ.

Let us refer to the women whose characters are touched by St. Luke's affluent pencil, and discriminated with exquisite refinement.

In the early chapters we find Elizabeth, Anna, the Blessed Virgin. The Mary of St. Luke is at once identical with the Mary of St. Matthew, and yet more full of life and colour. In St. Matthew, she is the pure and much-tried woman; put to shame, indeed, for a little in the eyes of her betrothed, but nobly justified by an angel's lips. She is "The Virgin"[2] of Isaiah's prophecy. We hear something of her at the visit of the Wise Men, something of her hurried flight into Egypt, and of her return into the land of Israel. But in the Apostle's delineation there is a singular reserve. Mary stands before us, the Mother-maid; splendid

[1] To the accusation against our Lord before Pilate, after διεστρέφομεν τὸν ἔθνος ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. (St. Luke xxiii. 2), the Martyrdom version of St. Luke adding, καὶ διεστρέφομεν τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα. (Epiphan. *Adv. Haeres.* xiii. 11.)

[2] It is significant that while we naturally say, "the Mother and Child" (with St. Luke ii. 16), St. Matthew repeatedly, and as if emphatically, writes, "the Child and Mother." (St. Matthew ii. 11-13, 14, 20, 21.)

in the light of prophecy—statuesque, silent as a picture, sad and beautiful as a dream. The Child Jesus is not so much upheld by her, as floating in light on her arms or upon her breast. But in St. Luke the picture is clothed in flesh and blood; the dream grows real. There is breath and poetry upon her lips. Her heart beats quicker at the angel's salutation. Maiden modesty and saintly resignation to burning shame fill her brief but pregnant words. The hoarded music of her soul finds measured utterance of its serene and stately joy. The *Magnificat*, chanted in so many churches, is the highest specimen of the subtle influence of the song of purity, so exquisitely described by a great poet. It is the *Pippa Passes* among the liturgies of the world. It is a woman teaching in the Church for ever without usurpation of authority, but with a saintly quietness,[1] that knows no end. The psychologist seems to sound the depths of that nature—ever watching and keeping close the several single things which are so many special utterances of God; ever comparing them with and interpreting them by, facts. He lets us see that as she kept them closely, so she kept them on through all circumstances.[2]

[1] 1 Timothy ii. 12.

[2] ἡ δὲ Μαρία πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. (St. Luke ii. 19.) (For the force of ἔθραε see Vaughan on *Ἐγένετο δὲ βόθρυνος*, i. 3. Westcott, *Ἐγένετο δὲ βόθρυνος*, i. 49.) ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα κ.τ.λ. *ibid.*

Many other forms succeed. The widow of Nain; the sinner who wipes the feet of Jesus with her long hair; the women which ministered unto Him of their substance—Mary that was called Magdalene, and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others; the impulsive woman who lifted up her voice and said unto Him, "blessed is the womb that bare Thee;" the contrasted natures of Mary and Martha; the weeping daughters of Jerusalem, called upon to

"pay betimes
A society of that mass of mouts to come"[1]—

the service done by women for the burial, and after the Resurrection as apostles to the Apostles.[2]

It is worthy of all notice that this mission of the

v. 51. The immediate context of the first of these two passages gives an exquisite specimen of that silent *contrast* which has such a charm for St. Luke. In vv. 15-20 we have five such instances. (1) The *angels*, and "the *men*, the *shepherds*" (οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ ποιμένες), v. 15. (2) The places to which they depart, vv. 17, 18, the angels to *heaven*, the men to *Bethlehem* (v. 15). (3) The simple pieces overflow of gaurality in the shepherds ("they made known concerning the saying which was spoken to them about this child"), to the worth of the heaven (v. 20). (4) The majestic silence of Mary (v. 19). (5) Yet another contrast—that silence with the simple burst of the shepherd's liturgy.

[1] Cassandra in *Troilus and Cressida*. Act i., Sc. 2.

[2] St. Luke viii. 11-16, 37-39; viii. 1-4; x. 38-42; xviii. 35-43; xxiii. 55 to xxiv. 12; xxiv. 22. The some characteristic parvulos the Acts of the Apostles (see Acts xii. 13); Lydia, the first European convert (xvi. 14, 15); Rhoda (xii. 13, 14); and Tabitha, the leader of that noble army of good women, veiled and unveiled, who have ministered to suffering humanity for so many ages (ix. 36-39).

Saviour to womanhood occurs so prominently in the Gospel for the Gentiles. Among them more especially woman was degraded—sometimes the mere useful drudge of the meanest household details; sometimes the helpless tool of hideous lusts; occasionally a royal harlot or a splendid tigress. The peculiar power given to her by her very weakness was scarcely recognized. At the hand and touch of Jesus, that hidden wealth of tenderness was disclosed. From her out of whom Jesus cast seven devils to the Chinese woman converted last year, womanhood confesses—"Christ first taught us that we were women." While the New Testament tells us of some wicked women, yet the Gospels give no record of any who actually opposed Jesus Himself during His ministry. Alas! that sad distinction has been reserved for later days—for those who compose romances in the long hours of leisure which they owe to His influence, and who write sarcastic essays with the hands which He has set free.

(*c*) We reserve for the last place the crowning fruit of this peculiar preparation of St. Luke's mind for the work of an evangelist. It is one of his superior Leading Ideas to apply this psychological penetration to the character and work of the Son of Man. Some of the chief instances of this may be given.

(*a*) As has already been indicated, we find in

the third Gospel the true successive developments of a true human life and nature. It is somewhat surprising, perhaps, to find the growth—corporal and moral—of John the Baptist and of the Holy One of God, spoken of, up to a certain point, in the same language.[1] At least it witnesses that the second was as truly human as the first.

(*b*) The effect of prayer upon two of the sublimest external phenomena in the Saviour's life is mentioned in conformity with this purpose of St. Luke. Prayer on His part is the psychological antecedent of the scene at the Baptism, and of the glory of the Transfiguration. To St. Luke alone we owe *both* notices. "Jesus having been baptized, and *while He was yet praying*, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily form as a dove."[2] It was even in *the* act of *His yet praying* that the fashion of His countenance became other.[3] There was not a magic cleaving of the heavens; a sudden and theatrical radiance steeping face, and form, and vesture. There was a human factor; a spiritual condition; a suitable antecedent, in the perfect Man. The inward glory grew outward, coalesced

[1] St. Luke i. 80; ii. 40. Note the πληρούμενον σοφίᾳ in the case of the child Jesus.

[2] Ἐγένετο δὲ...καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν. St. Luke iii. 21.

[3] Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον. St. Luke ix. 29.

with the opening sky, and melted into the light of heaven. Among human faces few, indeed, look like the face of an angel, or are touched with heavenly radiance. The only true light on any face is sure to be a light of prayer.

(*c*) We may call in this Leading Idea to explain to us statements, which sometimes seem incomprehensible—sometimes even degrading—as applied to one like Him, but which always "require studious regard with opportune delight."

Let us turn to some instances.

1. "It came to pass when the days were being fulfilled of His being received up."[1]—What can this mean, standing where it does, and speaking of a time before His death? Faith reads the riddle. "The style of the evangelist imitates the feeling of Jesus."[2] Again: "His sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling to the ground."[3] The academic Shimeis of England, and France, and Germany, may seek for stones to fling at Him from the dust of the garden. The French man of letters may cross Kedron, and wave out his scented blasphemies, leaving the unwholesome scent of Parisian patchouli under the olives of Gethsemane. Why that Agony, those big drops, that burst of

[1] ἐν τῷ συμπλ[ηρ]οῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ. St. Luke ix. 51. "As the time drew near its accomplishment, in which He was to be raised by death into His heavenly glory."—Rückenbach.

[2] Bengel *in loc.*

[3] St. Luke xxii. 44.

sorrow in which He was withdrawn[1] from His own? Why was He less firm than the martyrs, than Socrates, than the Stoics, than the Indian brave? The psychologist, who was also a physician, reveals fearlessly what believers have sometimes shrunk from exposing to the unbeliever's gaze.

2. In one beautiful passage, the martyred Bishop of Antioch speaks of the things which Jesus wrought by His *silence*; of that gentle and noiseless *quietude*, really to hear which is the fulness of Christian perfection.[2] This "passive side" of Christ's life is one of the Leading Ideas of St. Luke.

Under this comes the long retirement at Nazareth between the first journey to Jerusalem and the Baptism—emphasized by one entire section of the Gospel.[3] Under this head of the silent life again must be brought the repeated reference to the seclusion and prayers of Jesus. So "as the multitudes were thronging together to hear Him and to

[1] ἀπεκδεχόμενος St. Luke viii. 40.

[2] ἐν οἷς διδάσκων ἐν σιωπῇ ἐγίνετο· καὶ ἔκεινόν δὲ κινεῖται εἰμὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἔστιν. ὁ λόγος Ἰησοῦ κινηθείσου ἀνάβαν Κύριος· καὶ τὸν ἀκούειν κίνησιν ἔχουσιν, ἵνα τέλειος ᾖ ἵνα δὲ ἐν λαλεῖ πράσσῃ καὶ δι' ὧν σιγῇ γνώσκεται. IGNAT. *Epist. ad Ephes.* xv. "The silence here commemorated relates not to the counsels of God (as in sect. 19), but to the life of Christ."—Bishop LIGHTFOOT. *Apostolic Fathers*, ii. 69.

[3] St. Luke ii. 39-49. The twelve years' retirement in Nazareth; vv. 42-50, the visit to Jerusalem and questioning in the Temple; ii. 50 to iii. 23, the retirement of eighteen years in Nazareth.

be healed of their infirmities, He for His part was ever withdrawing in the deserts and praying.[1] So before the call of the Apostles, it is from this evangelist we learn that "He went out into the mountain to pray, and was all night through in prayer to God."[2] The Gospel is throughout a record of these silent prayers.[3] Another Leading Idea we should also range the silence of Jesus before Herod,[4]—a touch added by St. Luke to the picture of the silent Lamb in the other evangelists. To an age, precipitate, loquacious, and idolatrous of the immediate beyond any other in the history of Christianity, this greatness of the silent Jesus conveys too little that is impressive. With primitive Christianity at least it was different. The words "like a lamb dumb before his shearers, so opened He not His mouth" formed a central part of the text from which Philip preached Jesus to the treasurer of Candace. "When He was reviled, He reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened

[1] The contrast should be noted and the tenses—ἀνεχώρει δὲ καὶ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἐρήμοις καὶ προσηύχετο. St. Luke v. 15.

[2] ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ. St. Luke vi. 12.

[3] προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας. St. Luke iii. 21; v. 16; vi. 12; ix. 18, 28, 29; xi. 1 (omission of giving the Lord's Prayer); xxii. 41—44. ["Nullus tamen (excepta passionis historia) *praeter Johannem* ipsa verba precantis Jesu descripsit." Bengel.]

[4] St. Luke xxiii. 9; cf. for silence before Pilate, St. Matthew xxvii. 14; St. Mark xv. 3, 4; St. John xix. 8, 9. For silence before Jewish tribunal, St. Matthew xxvi. 62, 63; St. Mark xiv. 60, 61.

not," writes St. Peter.[1] The silence and retirement of Jesus throughout is a Leading Idea of St. Luke in his Gospel. That silence at the trials which brought Him to the cross was a circumstance which impressed most deeply His earliest disciples.[2]

II

Two thoughts of a practical kind arise directly from this part of our subject.

1. Our particular calling in life may introduce us to work of peculiar value for the cause of Christ.

An English Royal Academician has lately told us the story of the success of his career. He began by working for a coach-builder in early life. He was set to paint the panels of carriages, and thus acquired a practical knowledge of grinding and mixing colours, which was one of the great means of his success as an artist. The peculiar purity and brilliance of his colours was a secret learned

[1] Acts viii. 33-36; 1 Peter ii. 23.

[2] The last miracle of healing (St. Luke xxii. 51) may, from one point of view, be referred to this heading. We may observe it is an exquisite adjustment between full consciousness of the possession of superhuman power and resolution not to employ it one hair-breadth beyond the appointed limit; to exert it for another if need arose, in no degree for Himself. Ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου, says Jesus. Surely the musing-big is that He addresses the soldiers who have Him in charge—"allow Me only so long," "just up to this," *i. e.* to touching the wounded man's ear. As the *all-man* moment He transcends humanity and yet submits to injustice. The miracle is at once divine in its plenitude and in its economy of the sublime.

by the coach-builder's apprentice. The experience which Gibbon acquired as a Captain of the Hampshire Militia was of no little service to the historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. All preparatory training may be made subservient to a higher earthly end, and through it to a heavenly work.[1] Thus the very petty annoyances and vulgarities of daily life may one day be given a glorious oblation to our Master. The very homeroids and mice may be returned in gold to God.[2]

2. From the tone and Leading Ideas of St. Luke's Gospel we see that to the complexity and intricacy of human characters, to the variety of human minds and temperaments, Christ presents Himself with a wonderful adaptation. The soul—the very self—is a shrine hidden in a labyrinth. Round it there are a million ways, of which only one reaches to its centre. It has a strange inner chamber, where it waits, full often in anguish. It can hear with superficial comprehension the accents

[1] While these lines were being written, the obituary of the *Times* (January 23, 1891) contained a notice of the career of one who belonged to St. Luke's profession—Edward John Waring, M.D., C.I.E. Dr. Waring published two huge and well-known medical books, *Manual of Practical Therapeutics* and *Bazaar Medicines*. But his delight was in religious writings and philanthropic work, of which his "spiritual mission" was the most original and teaching. His motto might have been taken from the physician St. Luke: ἐφάνησαν καὶὡς ἰατροὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. (St. Luke iii. 21.)

[2] 1 Samuel vi. 17, 18.

of a million tongues. But only one goes completely home to it. Christ knows that shrine, and how to reach it; His feet are on the very path by which He can enter it. Christ speaks in every tongue of the earth, in every accent of those many tongues. To each one of us He can address Himself in the accent which wins our most pathetic smiles and our sweetest tears. The motto of Christ's manifestation to our hearts is the motto of the Gospel of the beloved physician—that "the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."

[As the *Evangelium Marcionis* has been several times referred to, it may be well to add that it is quite different from the Gospels which are known as "apocryphal." It is the Gospel according to St. Luke carefully compiled and mutilated by Marcion for dogmatic purposes. Epiphanius, Tertullian, and a pseudo-Origenist dialogue show what passages Marcion cut out, as well as those which he changed according to his own ideas. The Marcionite variants have no claim to be dignified as readings. See *Evang. Apocryph.* TISCHEND. *Prolog.* xi. n. 1.]

NOTE A

In what mode our Lord's miraculous healings took place we are not in a position to define.

That cures of a wonderful character occurred the ablest modern rationalists feel themselves absolutely unable to deny. The accepted theory of the school has been expressed by its two foremost advocates.

M. Renan writes: "Who will venture to deny that in many cases, and keeping outside definite lesions, contact with an exquisite personality may do more than all the resources of the pharmacopœia? The very pleasure of seeing such an individual cures. It gives what it can—a light, a hope—and that is not quite in vain. Scientific medicine (founded few centuries before in Europe) was, in the days of Jesus, unknown to the Jews of Palestine. In such a condition of knowledge, the presence of a man of lofty superiority, treating the invalid with gentleness, and giving him, by some sensible sign, assurance of his recovery, is often a decisive remedy." (*Vie de Jésus*. RENAN. 226.) Another less widely celebrated, but, we venture to think, greatly more sincere and profound teacher of the same school, argues more spiritually and tenderly upon the same lines. Schenkel sees in Jesus as the healer of the sick an exceptionally-gifted man, enjoying a *natural* endowment to the highest recorded point in the history of the human race. The assurance from one so gentle and so holy, penetrating in some cases to the connection of the prolonged suffering with some hidden cause, "lashed the diseased nervous system of the man as if with an electric stream, and restored to him the use of his limbs." Still this power, producing as it did an effect inexplicable by reference to any common standard, was, in point of fact, a "natural human gift."[1] But surely it is useless to play with the word "natural." The magic natural (*i.e.* merely unusual) influence upon the sick of certain beautifully-endowed personalities may give us some analogical conception of the line upon which our Lord's mission of healing moved.

[1] See Schenkel. *Characteristik Jesu*. 67-69.

Certainly the measure of healing influence was narrowed or expanded by the measure of spiritual susceptibility. (St. Matthew xiii. 58; St. Mark vi. 5.) But as "natural human gifts" thus enabled, and become the appanage of a being with the claims put forth by Jesus, *is supernatural*.

It could be absolutely proved that this theory of Schanked supplied us with the true conception of the *mode* by which, and of the plane along which, the centrive power of Jesus moved, we are unable to see that the evidential value of the facts in question would be impaired in the slightest degree. Law, with its detective instruments and abounding instincts of order, would have pushed over into yet another province. But it cannot push out God. To equal our ignorance is not to expel the divine Presence. It is chilishness—or atheism—to hold that every mile gained by law is a mile stolen *from* God.

NOTE B

Recent investigations carefully pursued by the "Psychical Research Society" appear to give ground for arriving at some important conclusions upon the subject of possession. The reported phenomena of one case of trance-mediumship force us to one or other of three conclusions: either (1) the trance-medium is an *impostor* (which very painstaking and prolonged observation by acute intellects does not in this case seem to prove); or (2) there are obscure *substrata* of consciousness and memory in persons present and brought into contact with the "trance-medium," which communicate their contents by some process of projection to that individual; or (3) indestructible elements of personality cling round the central permanent individual consciousness after its severance from the body. In the case of those who are separated from the light and life of God, these indestructible elements are permitted at times to manifest themselves through association with the corporeal organization of some living individual, who yields to the suggestion of this evil personality. These occult phenomena in the nineteenth century bear a striking

resemblance to those recorded in the Gospels in the following respects :—

(*a*) The whole personality of the individual suffers intermittent changes at uncertain intervals.

(*b*) A *secondary* personality sub-introduces itself, and uses the corporeal organization of the first ; while the ordinary personality is in partial suspense or suppression, quiescent, and merely physically alive. (*Proceedings of Society for Psychical Research.* December 1890. P. 458.) Sometimes

(*c*) The primary personality is invaded by *more than one* personality (*Ibid.* Pp. 453, 524.)

(*d*) Convulsive twitchings and epilepsy or epileptiform affections are the prelude, condition, or result of single, duplex, or multiform personality. (*Ibid.* Pp. 448-449.)

The Scripture narratives of possession are illustrated ; and that with a freedom and naturalness of expression which shows that the language is not a mere plagiarism from the sacred text. *E.g.*, "If I take possession of the medium's body, and she grows ill, I can use her organization to tell the world important truths." (*Proceedings of Society for Psychical Research.* December 1890. P. 516.) "It's a mistake not to believe in God. Christ was a reflexion of God, and we are a reflexion of Him. He is infinitely superior to everybody. He is the real reflexion, we are secondary reflexions." (*Ibid.* P. 545.) cf. St. Matthew viii. 29 ; St. Mark i. 24, 34 ; Acts xvi. 16, 17 ; St. James ii. 19. For duplex or multiform possession, see St. Matthew xii. 45 ; St. Mark xvi. 9 ; St. Luke viii. 37, 38 ; for power of affecting an organization, St. Matthew viii. 43, 44 ; for epileptiform symptoms, St. Mark ix. 18, 23.) A large part of the utterances of the "trance-medium" are extremely silly. No doubt ; but a vast number of wicked people in the flesh are extremely silly also—and one does not see why the act of dying should necessarily endow them with a lofty wisdom. If the communications are genuine, they prove that the personalities who utter them are very silly ; but they prove also that they are very restless and miserable. (Cf. St. Luke xi. 24.) It may be added that cases of personal, real or supposed, are well known among the Hindus. A respected convert

of high literary eminence, the author of a long series of Christian and philological works, lately published a book in which he solemnly declared that at one period of his life "a Mohammedan spirit took possession of him;" that, under the influence, he was at first "very violent;" that "the influence" repeatedly "entered him," and on one occasion compelled him to go at night and stop under a tree in a neighbouring village. "Since his conversion he has never been troubled in this way." (*Omar Hindu, mon Christian. The Early Life of Sadu Pandunajh. An Autobiography*. Translated from the Mundhi language. Hatchard & Co. 1862. p. 56, 57.)

For demons and demoniacal possession in the Old Testament, see 1 Samuel xvi. 14, 16, 23. *Cf.* Isaiah xiii. 21, 22; xxxiv. 14. (לילית, שעירים, *see* Lexicon); also in Apocrypha, Baruch iv. 35. Tobit iii. 8, 17; vi. 7, 14, 15, 17; viii. 3.

NOTE C

One of the most important divisions of true experimental psychology must always be connected with the theory of temperaments. The two chief recent classifications of temperament are those of Wundt and Lotze. From the able analysis of Lotze's classification by a recent and most competent philosopher, the writer extracts some sentences which curiously illustrate this portion of our Lord's dealings with one model of human nature. "For the temperament usually called 'melancholic' Lotze would substitute the term *sentimental*. This temperament is distinguished by 'special receptivity for the feeling of the value of all possible relations,' but is indifferent toward bare *matter of fact*. It implies a lively appreciation of harmony and discord, great variety of aesthetical feeling and imaginative activity, often with theoretical vagueness, ready yielding of the sense of duty to inclination, and dislike of hard work." *Physiological Psychology*. Chapter xviii. Lotze, *Classification of Temperament*. P. 459. By Professor George Trumbull Ladd.)

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

C

FROM HIS NATURAL ENDOWMENT

"Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off."—ISAIAH xxxiii. 17.[1]

MEN, as we know, come into the world with a different stock of tendencies, with different endowments. A few may say of themselves, "there was a star danced when I was born." They are endowed with a sense of Beauty.

Of Beauty the best definition probably is a very old one. "The essence of the beautiful consists in *amplitude* and *order*."[2] The *sublime* and the *pretty* are two opposite modifications. The *sublime* is the Beautiful, with its amplitude pushed into indefinite

[1] מֶלֶךְ בְּיָפְיוֹ תֶּחֱזֶינָה עֵינֶיךָ תִּרְאֶינָה אֶרֶץ מַרְחֹקִים׃

[2] τὸ γὰρ καλὸν τὸ μεγέθει καὶ τάξει ἔστιν. ARIST. *Poet.* vii.

vastness, and the tender smile, which is its inevitable tribute, exchanged for a certain awe. The *pretty* is at the opposite end of the measurement. It is beauty so reduced on the scale as to want the nobility of seriousness; so petty that our admiration is not without a certain intermixture of contempt. The Beautiful, when it approaches the verge of terror at one extreme or of contempt at the other, when it begins to be feared or patronised, may soon have to be called by another name.

The soul and the actions of man are properly, and not merely by analogy, termed beautiful. There are natures so large and so conformed to moral harmony that we instinctively term them beautiful. There are actions which show so much of the beauty of the soul from which they proceed that we call them also beautiful.

This high endowment St. Luke possessed. Consequently he looks upon Christ with a gifted vision. "His eyes saw the King in His beauty."

I

From this endowment one Leading Idea of the third Gospel naturally arises—the conception that the human soul and actions of Jesus were supremely beautiful.

This is not so much a logical principle of division or an historical framework, as an atmosphere in

which it lies. The memoir is full of the overpowering conviction that Christ is "fairer than the children of men;" that the record of the life of Jesus is full of joy and beauty, as well as of truth and power, so that its motto might be—"blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see."[1]

A well-known tradition makes St. Luke a painter. This tradition is not very ancient. It is not to be found in any writer before the sixth century. It is the thirteenth century before he appears as the patron saint of painters. He was not a painter. One of the most learned of living Roman Catholics writes—"all Protestants and not a few Catholics deny this."[2]

So the evangelist who never painted the form of the Son of Man on canvas, or laid it in rich enamel, has given us the most attractive picture of Him.[3] In St. Matthew, He is Israel's Monarch; in St. Mark, He is the Son of God; in St. John, He is the Word made Flesh; in St. Luke (while the title of the Lord is sometimes met with, the Lord Jesus being most frequently found[4]) we are led to think the emblem of the Man more appropriate than that of the ox, which yet suits so well

[1] St. Luke v. 23.

[2] "Ego enim eum fuisse pictorem mediocrem, cito agnoscam pictorem, omnium prestantissimum est evangelistam egisse." DARK. *ibid.*

[3] DARK. *Hist. Rev. Dev.* ii. 285.

[4] St. Luke vii. 13; x. 1; xi. 39; xii. 42; xiii. 31; xiii. 61; xxiv. 3.

the priestly story at the beginning, and the overpowering conviction of the sacrifice at the end. For in St. Luke, He is pre-eminently the Son of Man; loving, pitying, pardoning a fallen race; anointed to heal the broken-hearted,[1] leaving the ninety and nine that He may bear the lost with all the strength and tenderness of that Divine Manhood. St. Luke may not have the lion strength of St. Mark, nor the eagle flight of St. John. The words of Christ recorded by him may be conversations rather than discourses. But the Christ in St. Luke is especially the Son of Man;—the Child, wrapped in swaddling clothes and cradled upon a human breast; growing with true human growth in the holy home; not merely letting tears rain down[2] as by the grave of Lazarus, but breaking into sobs of lamentation over Jerusalem,[3] the kneeler in Gethsemane, supported by His creature, yet so divinely drawn, that faith adores the Lord of angels, strengthened by an angel, and the Son of God writhing like a trodden worm.[4] Men complain of sameness in sacred art. Even the rationalist can teach us, that they "who would give it freshness must steep their minds in the New Testament."[5]

[1] Luke iv. 16, 22. Isaiah lxi. 1, 2. How beautiful in its pathos must have been His look and voice when He Himself applied the prophetic word!

[2] Ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. St. John xi. 35.

[3] Ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ. St. Luke xix. 41.

[4] St. Luke xxii. 41-44.

[5] M. Révillo.

They must have present to them not merely the traditional Judge on the one hand, not merely the soft and nerveless beauty of a Syrian Adonis on the other; but the Son of Man, sublime in noble wrath as well as noble tenderness, who uttered the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, as well as those of the Lost Sheep and of the Prodigal. Not written by a painter, this is yet a painter's Gospel. From it come the favourite subjects:—the Virgin and Child, Simeon, the scene with the Doctors in the Temple, the Ascension. A well-known statesman once spoke of the ephemeral nature of the results effected by his craft in contrast with the immortal productions of art, in the language of a humiliation so unfeigned that it would be improper to dispute its truth. "Our labours seem to terminate with the day on which they are done, and to leave no trace behind them. It is the happy lot of artists to produce and bequeath to mankind that which becomes part and parcel of their permanent inheritance."[1] The picture in St. Luke's Gospel is a thing of beauty, which is a joy for ever.

Above all let us compare the idyll of Bethlehem at the beginning with that yet more beautiful idyll of heaven at the close.[2] The first has, no doubt, commended itself more extensively to Christendom than the last. We are selfish creatures and the best

[1] Mr. Gladstone at the banquet of the Royal Academy, 1875.

[2] St. Luke ii. 9, 15: xxiv. 50, 53.

Our gain is more to us than our Saviour's loss and humiliation. His exaltation does not commend itself to us so directly as connected with our own salvation.

When we contrast the close with the beginning of St. Luke,—the narrative of the Ascension with that of Christmas in the second chapter, we may find an inner evidence of its truth.[1] What have we at Christmas? The Son of God condescends to an unspeakable humiliation; yet the Angel of the Lord speaks to the shepherds, and the earth quivers with unearthly music. What have we at Ascension-tide? The victory is won. The shadows of Gethsemane and the clouds of Calvary have melted away. The hands of the High Priest are lifted up, and joy drops down from them like dew; and He is in the eternal calm, Who is deathless for evermore. Surely there are songs now. It may have been, as some of old thought, that God literally "went up with a merry noise, and the Lord with the voice of the trump."[2] But if so, it was in heaven behind the veil, behind the silence of the infinite spaces. No echoes reach the earth. The whole narrative has the softness of some exquisite dream;

[1] Psalm xxiv. 3, 7, 10; xlvii. 5.

[2] "Ut Chrysost. notat, quod ad corporeos sterptitus attinet, ascendit in silentio. Fortasse non ceti vel neque audiri chori angelorum, et in Nubibus. Sed tamen dubitari non potest quin cohortes angelorum legiones ineffabili jubilo deferentes Dominum gloriæ in gloriam suam." Psalm xlvii. 5. BELLARM. *in Psalm.* i. p. 335.

but it is not evanescent like a dream. It has the repression, the naturalness, the straightforwardness of truth. The historian of the ministry of angels invents no angels' song. Those who appear are seen as "two men in white apparel."[1] If a human writer had invented or adorned the narrative, there would have been a silence round the cradle as deep as that upon the Arctic sea; there would have been lines of angels, and a great music round the disappearing form. If the story had been mythical or imaginative, all the songs would have been for the Ascension, all the silence for the Christmas; because it is divine, the song is at Christmas, the silence at the Ascension.

St. Luke never pauses to say with self-reflective emphasis—"see how beautiful this is!" There is nothing grimacing or theatrical about his style. He leaves the picture of the King in His beauty to the heart of the Church.

The inner meaning of his purpose seems to be that of St. Bernard, "I speak of Thee in Thy sweetness more than in Thy sublimity—as the anointed, rather than as the lofty One."[2]

[1] Εσθῆσι βλε. Acts i. 10.

[2] "Suavem magis quàm sublimem, et unctum non altum loquor." S. Bernard *in Cant.*

II

There are two adjuncts immediately connected with this Leading Idea of our Evangelist.

1. St. Luke's is the Gospel of the holy Angels so far as this, that there is special mention of their ministry both to the Son of Man and to His people.

The Gentile evangelist; the only Gentile writer of any book of the sacred Canon, addressed himself specially to Greek Christendom, and to what in former days might have been called the "Greekish" mind.[1]

The Greeks were pre-eminently endowed with the love and perception of beauty. They were unrivalled artists.[2] Our historians of the first rank have assuredly learned from contact with Greek models the balance of the masses of composition, the just perspective, the artistic juncture of historical narrative. Our philosophers have been trained by the majestic common sense of Aristotle, or by the superb idealism of Plato. Scarcely one of our poets

[1] "All the *Greekish* heads, which with one voice," &c. (*Troilus and Cressida*, Act ii. Sc. 3. So *passim* in that drama.)

[2] γένος χαρίεν μάλιστ' ἀγαπώμενον. (PERICLES in *Thucyd.* Lib. ii. c. 41.) This consummate versatility, which always managed to be graceful, is hit off by Shakespeare with his all-comprehending pains. Cf. the passage in *Troilus and Cressida* beginning—"The Grecian youths are full of quality." Act iv. Sc. 4. See note 1, *infr.* p. 137.

of the first class has failed to feel the vivifying touch of Greek genius. The son of a stable-keeper, ignorant of Greek, capable of approaching the wonderful creations of Greek poets only with the interpolation of the clumsy veil of translation and of Lemprière, became imbued with its subtle loveliness. From Keats, the sweet contagion spread to Tennyson, Arnold, and Swinburne. Even Wordsworth touched in *Laodamia* the calmest sweetness, the most sustained dignity which was ever attained by his thoughtful but unequal muse.

Greek mythology was the most beautiful in the world.[1] It could incorporate and [illegible] commodious

[1] The lovely Grecian is a land of hills,
Rivers and fertile plains and sounding shores,
Under a vape of sky more variable,
Could find commodious place for every god.
In that fair clime the lonely herdsman stretch'd
On the soft grass through half a summer's day
With music lulled his indolent repose.
A distant strain—
If he chanced to hear,
Even from the blazing sun his fancy fetch'd
A beardless youth, who touch'd a golden lute,
And filled the illumined grove with ravishment.
Sunbeams upon distant hills
Might with small help from fancy be transformed
Into fleet Oreads.
Withered troughs grotesque,
Stripp'd of their leaves and twigs—
There were the lurking Satyrs—Pan himself
The simple shepherds' awe-inspiring god.
WORDSWORTH, *The Excursion*. Book iv.

place for every god[1] from every climate, who brought with him the passport of charm. The land was haunted by spirits, lovely or sportive. When the light of truth fell upon the earth, did it bring nothing but disenchantment? Must earth and heaven seem poorer, unpeopled of all those radiant shapes?[2]

St. Luke's Gospel must have suggested part of the answer to this question. His narrative shows us in detail the living and continuous realization of the most beautiful vision of the Hebrew story—the "angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."[3] The words spoken by the angels in the synoptical evangelists are few and brief. We can almost count the syllables,[4] accorded as if penuriously. In particular, we owe to St. Luke those angel-uttered words which

[1] The idea referred to (*supr.* p. 135, and note 2) must have been present to the historian who records St. Paul's discourse at Athens. He knew the philosophical and artistic spirit of the place. He had observed (or his Apostolic prompter had taught him) the fair leisure given by the order of Athenian life and society to the ever newer newness of speculations, the later than the latest novelty of thought. (Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες . . . εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐπιτήδευον ἢ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκούειν καινότερον. Acts xvii. 21.) Sculpture is finely described—not merely as so much splendid material ("gold, or silver, or marble"), but as "graven whose essence is art in expression and loftiness of human thought in conception." (οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον. Acts xvii. 29, 30.)

[2] Genesis xxviii. 12. St. John i. 51.

[3] St. Matthew i. 20, 21; ii. 13-20; iv. 11. St. Luke i. 26-38; ii. 9, 10, 13, 14; xxiv. 5-8. St. Mark vi. 5, 6, 7. Contrast St. Luke i. 13-18, 28-37; ii. 10-17; xxiv. 5-8.

form so exquisite a shrine for the dogma of the Incarnation.[3]

Our most complete revelations, whether of the functions of the holy angels towards the Saviour during His life-walk on earth, or of their relation to us, are to be found in St. Luke.

(*a*) We may compare the briefer version of Christ's words in St. Mark with the more articulately divided threefold glory of the second coming in St. Luke,[4] wherein the holy angels have their distinct region of circumstance. (*b*) We should also notice the emphatic heightening of joy or shame in acknowledgment or denial by the Son of Man, "in presence of the angels of God."[5] (*c*) In words recorded by St. Luke alone, Jesus brings the conversion of sinners within the cognizance and sympathy of angels. "To the tears of penitents are the wine of angels."[6] (*d*) To St. Luke we owe the clearer colouring of the noble passage which contains one of the few particular revelations of the condition of the future life for the redeemed. "They neither marry nor are given in marriage, for they are *equal unto the angels*."[7] (*e*) The incident of the

[3] St. Luke i. 35.

[4] Cf. the more indefinite "in the glory of the Father with the holy angels" (St. Mark viii. 38) with ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων—(St. Luke ix. 26).

[5] St. Luke xii. 8, 9. [6] *Ibid.* xv. 10.

[7] Cf. St. Luke xx. 36 with St. Matthew xxii. 30. St. Mark xii. 25. See the very interesting passage in *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 409, 410.

strengthening angel in Gethsemane is one of the peculiar gems of the third Gospel.[1] (*f*) There is a special fulness in the narrative about angels at the Resurrection.[2] (*g*) To this we may well add no less than twenty-two records of angels in the Acts of the Apostles. Two of these may be singled out as indicating how familiar the thought of angels was to the mind of the holy writer. "An angel of the Lord said, Go ye and stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of *this life*."[3] Much grammatical ingenuity has been wasted upon words which seem so singular. "Departed this life" upon a tombstone is intelligible enough to *us*—from *our* point of view. The psychological evangelist felt that an angel would speak of eternal life as "*this* life," from *his* point of view. It was the life of eternity which the Apostle proclaimed in time. Once more. "They saw the face of Stephen as it had been the face of an angel."[4] This is not a touch of facile poetry. The writer knew too much about the angels to use their name so lightly. (*h*) It should be noticed that there are more glimpses of the world unseen in this than in any other Gospel.[5] We must observe at the close of this section that the

[1] St. Luke xxii. 43.
[2] *Ibid.* xxiv. 4, 5; *cf.* Acts i. 10.
[3] Acts v. 25.
[4] *Ibid.* vi. 15.
[5] *Ibid.* xvi. 9, 19-31. "Paradise" in xxiii. 43.

ministry of holy angels to our Lord, during and after the temptation, recorded by the two other synoptics,[1] is omitted by St. Luke. A Leading Idea with an evangelist is not an over-mastering hobby. It is kept within bounds by a divine sobriety of judgment. It does not obtrude itself upon us, but requires reverent study.

2. The third Gospel is the Gospel of Poetry.

This is the case, not only as regards the many incidents which the imagination of Christendom has always felt to be in their nature poetical as distinct from legendary.

Rhythmic bursts in parallelism, and what we may call choral vibrations, are of frequent occurrence. The angels' song is incorporated with the Eucharistic Services; the *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, *Benedictus*, with the liturgies of the Christian world. The language seems at times just to stop short upon the verge of a burst of chanting; we are half disappointed at not hearing the Amen.[2] In the parable of the Prodigal there is a refrain. It is as if the heart of God conformed to the way of human emotion, which repeats the language of its sorrow turned into joy, with a sweet iteration, circling round and round the grief which has so

[1] St. Matthew iv. 11; St. Mark i. 13.

[2] "The shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God." St. Luke ii. 20.

long been habitual, and the joy which displaces it.[1] The acclamation of the multitude on Palm Sunday is given in a highly liturgical form as compared with the parallels in the two other synoptics,[2] and surely points back to the first *Gloria in Excelsis*. The pathetic cry of Jesus to the "daughters of Jerusalem" has inspired Mendelssohn.[3] Think too of the anthem-like close—"continually in the temple praising and blessing God"—with the Amen, the natural close of the liturgical Gospel (unhappily expunged in the R.V.) The whole Gospel is like a noble drama, which has a chorus to meet from time to time the splendour, or the pathos, or the majesty, of its development, now wailing, now triumphing—or we seem to be walking in a sacred cloister, not knowing when some hand will "rip up the organ with its thunder-stroke," and fill the place with music.

The question of the personal appearance of the Son of Man in the days of His flesh has often excited a reverent curiosity. It may be

[1] ἀέναε ἐλέλιξε μοῦσα
πνεῦσε δ', καὶ ἀνίζουσα,
ἷν ἐκκλησιάσῃ,
καὶ εὐφήμει (v. 24).
Cf. ἐλελιχὰν ἐνὶ οἴκῳ
πνεῦσε δι' κ.τ.λ. (*Iliad*, xi).

[2] St. Luke xix. 38; *cf.* St. Matthew xxi. 9; St. Mark xi. 9, 10; St. John xii. 13.

[3] St. Luke xxiii. 28.

said that there are two types of this image in Christendom. In one, the Christ is hard and stern, and wan worn;[1] in the other He has a soft fair beauty, with chestnut hair.[2] Every Christian

[1] Justin M. appears to express a wide-spread feeling (*οὐ γὰρ πρέπειν παρουσίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ καὶ ἄτιμον καὶ ἀειδῆ καὶ θνητὸν, κ.τ.λ. Dialog., Tryph.* 14. *δὺς παρουσίαν . . . μὰ μὴν ἢ ἀμόρφου καὶ ἄτιμου καὶ ἀειδοῦς. Ibid.* 49, *cf.* 85, 121, 131, also, almost like a formula, *Apolog.* i. 50). See RHEINWALD, *Die Kirchliche Archäologie*, pp. 1–4.

[2] This view is represented with great beauty, but perhaps in somewhat too learned and florid a style, in his Edwin Arnold's splendid poem, after the so-called letter of Lentulus.

"Wine-colour'd shone His hair
Glittering and waved, an aureole folded down
In long ray-lighted locks, which fell and flowed
Fair parted from the middle of His head,
After the manner of the Nazarites.
Even and clear His forehead; none and much
Faultless of grain, and full and soft the hand
Forked, of the hazelled colour of His hair.
The great eyes blue and radiant.
. . . Not oftlimes seen to smile,
More oft to weep . . . .
Among the sons of men honest and first."

The Light of the World, bk. iii.; *The Alabaster Box*, pp. 134, 135.

In a life of our Lord, which attained much celebrity in France about a quarter of a century ago, it is wisely said, "M. Renan supposes that Jesus had some of those regular faces which sometimes appear in the Jewish race (*Vie de Jésus*, p. 80). It is remarkable that the East, in its mosaics and pictures, has always presented the Christ with a severe face, while the West has sunk to a soft fair face

heart may be sure that there was about Him moral beauty; the beauty of thought and expression, which radiates through the veil of flesh and sense, which is consistent with sorrow, with a body destitute of the lines of grace, with the trials that make a man old before his time.[1] Half the ugliness of human faces is moral ugliness. There are, no doubt, faces beautiful in youth, which, as Plato says, we can easily foretell will be hideous in old age. But infinitely worse are the sinister look of craft, the leer, the scowl, the heaviness, which are the visible expression of petty designs puckering a network of lines—of unworthy thoughts and ignoble lives. Half the beauty in the world is moral beauty too, which shines through the eyes that are pure and candid, and breathes through the lips that speak of truth and gentleness. Whatever His form and features may have been, He must have looked beautiful who said—"and He layeth it on His shoulders." Weary as He was and wan, white with exhaustion and dropped with

with a rich colour. I must confess that the grand mosaics of the Calvary at Jerusalem, and of the beautiful Byzantine apses, possessed by Greece and Italy, go more directly to the soul. The gentle Galilean cannot properly be represented with light hair, nor with a curled beard, grandfully divided. Art should avoid the hardness of the mosaics without falling into the insipidity of our painters."—MICHIEL, *Fin de Siècle*, 1897, 198.

[1] "Which for a face not beautiful does more
Than beauty for the fairest face can do."
WORDSWORTH, *Excursion*, bk. vi.

blood, He must have looked beautiful who said—"Father, forgive them."

III

One inference occurs naturally.

Such a Gospel, received as an authoritative record, must produce a religion of beauty. Of Christian rites or symbolism (save of the highest of all—the Holy Eucharist); of painting, poetry, vestments, sacred buildings—it says nothing. But sacred art must awaken at its touch.

There are good people who sometimes ask—"will nothing ensure us a *regime* of ugliness in public worship?" Such a *regime* is, they think, mysteriously connected with purity of doctrine. It is safe from its uninteresting placidity. Above all, it is very cheap.

One thing, *if* it were only possible to secure it, might bring about the desired end. If these votaries could only get rid of St. Luke's Gospel and of the consequences which flow from it; if they could obliterate not only the millions of copies, printed upon paper, but the ineffaceable memories stamped upon innumerable hearts—the shapes transferred from it to the canvas, or where the sunlight is sheathed in the painted pane—the music which has formed the golden commentary upon its inspired chants!

From one evil this tendency in St. Luke's Gospel may save young souls. A man of lofty character and noble genius, whose life up to middle age was that of a saintly minister of the Calvinistic Church of Geneva, but who afterwards parted not only with faith in Christ but with belief in God and immortality—placed in an English parsonage as the pupil of a devoted English clergyman, in the course of a period of severe study became the subject of what appeared to himself and to others an entire conversion. More than thirty years after in analysing the movement under whose influence he had come in the Monmouthshire rectory, M. Scherer wrote—"Faith became a *credo*; one had only to possess its mechanism and repeat its formula. No more contemplation or poetry! When the human soul turned from earth to heaven, asking to slake its immortal thirst, it was answered by arid receipts or barren syllogisms. The love of the past was heresy. Attachment to the fair forms of worship was superstition. The yearning after adoration, penitence, self-sacrifice, was a departure from evangelical faith. All the vagueness and tenderness, all that is most religious in religion, was neglected or held cheap."[1] Who can tell what fatal effect such an experience at the beginning of the religious life may have had upon a

[1] *Edmond Scherer.* Par Octave Gérard de l'Académie Française (p. 13).

sensitive spirit—gifted with such a perception of intellectual and spiritual beauty? One result of the principle of St. Luke's Gospel would be to save religion from a shape so rigid and repulsive.

Above all—for how many does life, as it draws on towards its evening, become ugly and narrow in uncongenial surroundings. It becomes ugly. When we started it seemed to us that the fields through which we were walking brought us to a thousand forms, to any of which we might address ourselves at will, and if we found it disappointing turn readily to another. But, after a few years, we discover that we are tied to one remorseless, angular reality, from which we can never emancipate ourselves. Life becomes narrow too.

> "The single proposition that hope makes
> In all designs begun on earth below
> Fails in the promised largeness."[1]

Oh that we might lay hold upon the Christ of St. Luke's delineation! These words of the old prophet, poet as well as seer—able with one pencil-stroke to indicate upon a limited canvas the distances which present infinity to the imagination—become true in a higher sense than the first. Of the child of God these are the privileges. Loftiness of creed—"he shall dwell on high." Security in order and dogma—"his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks." The food of the word

[1] *Troilus and Cressida.* (Act i. Sc. 3.)

and of the blessed Eucharist—"his bread shall be given him." A spiritual life issuing from his baptism—"his waters shall be sure."[1] Something more. The promise turns from history or prediction to an address to the believer personally.[2] Christ shall be manifested to him, as St. Luke draws Him—"thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty." One magic word suggests a boundless enlargement of soul from this. It is a strange word, such as only poets can find—"they shall behold a land of farnesses,"—of sunny distances with distances still beyond.[3]

[1] Isaiah xxxiii. 16.

[2] Note the change from "*his* place of defence, his bread, his waters" (v. 16), to "*thine* eyes" (v. 17).

[3] מרחקים. *Lex Lutinatus* gives us a good idea of the lofty and picturesque indefiniteness of the Hebrew word.

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

D

IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE INCARNATION

"And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men. And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us."—ST. LUKE ii. 10–15.

THE Leading Ideas of the narrative of the Incarnation, in St. Luke's Gospel, the aspects from which he himself regarded it, and from which he wished the Church to regard it, are suggested in a summary form by this glorious passage.

The Saviour, the Messiah and Lord, is no shadowy, unreal being. He is really born, a real Babe, wrapped in swaddling clothes, in a definite place at a definite time.[1] The Incarnation is *real*. He is Incarnate not only for Israel, but for all who have a share in humanity.[2] His Incarnation is of *universal* significance and efficacy. Earth itself is the sphere of the peace which He brings; the good-will of the heart of God encircles, and dwells in *men*.[3] The Incarnation is a *joyful* dogma; a fact to be received with enthusiastic *delight*. "I bring you good tidings of great joy."

[1] ἐτέχθη σήμερον . . . ἐν πόλει Δαυείδ . . . βρέφος . . . ἐσπαργανωμένον. St. Luke ii. 11, 12.

[2] This cannot be concluded—at least directly—from the first part of the angel's message. "To all people" (A.V.) goes beyond παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, "to all the people" (R.V.).

[3] The true reading and division seems to be:

ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία,
καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη,
ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία.

The third line of the parallelism suggests the connecting link. The two first lines have the character of a prayer; ἔστω is understood.

"Be there glory to God in the higher;
And be there on earth peace—
If the relation of the third five were to be logically expressed, we should have a causal particle (ὅτι or the like), and a verb in the indicative (ἐστί).

"For amongst men is God's good-will."

(See *Commentaries* on *l'Evang. de Saint Luc*. Par F. Godet, tom. i. 105, 106.)

The Incarnation is the most *beautiful* of the manifestations of God. History, without ceasing to be history, walks under a sky of magic, and speaks in the lofty and rhythmical language of poetical intensity.

I

The Incarnation is *real*. St. Luke's Leading Idea is this.

At a definite date in human history a Divine Person assumed Human Nature by a birth in time of a virgin's womb, in a scene of incomparable beauty, with the admiring sympathy of the hosts of heaven, with the instinctive enthusiastic rapture of elect and meditative souls. That birth, wrought by a new contact with the creative power of God the Holy Ghost, was a true human birth. Whatever human mothers contribute to the entire production of their children was contributed by her who is truly the Mother of Jesus—viz., conception, formation, nativity.[1] It was a true human body. There was with equal truth a true human soul—*i.e.* with a *will* really capable of choice; with an *intellect* really capable of learning; with really felt *desires* for sustenance as regarded food, for sympathy as regarded companionship, for deliverance

[1] "Ex Maria sumptum est substantiâ quicquid non solum ad σύλληψιν (conceptionem) sed etiam ad nativitatem matri fœtis cedebat." (BERGEL. *Comm. in Luc.* i. 35.)

as regarded pain—with real sinless *emotions* such as indignation at wrong, pity, wonder, vivid expectation.[1]

The reality of the Incarnation, St. Luke shows us, was twofold—(1) *physiological*, and (2) *historical*.

(1) The Incarnation was a *physiological* reality.

The same medical preparation which pervades the whole texture of St. Luke's language influences and forms a Leading Idea in his record of the Incarnation. The angel's answer to Mary's question "how shall this be?" preserved in the third Gospel, is—"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing which is to be born,[2] shall be called the Son of God."[3] Surely we have here a sentence whose fulness of thought and delicate transparency of expression come to us from the sphere in which the Miracle of miracles was wrought. The whole sentence is packed with thought. "There is something which is to be born; that which is to be born is holy; that Holy Thing is to be, and to be owned to be, the Son of God. All this is inferred from the words just preceding in the angel's utterance in this way—'The Holy Ghost shall come upon

[1] The student should read again and again the wonderfully weighty and compacted sentence in Isaac Barrow *On the Creed*. Sermon I.

[2] τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον. The words *de eo* are, probably, to be rejected.

[3] St. Luke i. 35.

thee;' *therefore* 'that which is to be born shall be called Holy.' 'The power of the Highest shall overshadow thee;' *therefore* 'that Holy Thing shall be called the Son of God.'[1] The whole sentence is a divine mixture of reserve and of enthusiasm. It is like a smile of heaven over the glory of the eternal wisdom and love in bringing its most consumate work from the labyrinth of ante-natal fatalities through which man passes into the world. It is thus that the purity of an angel

[1] Bangel, *ut supra*.

Pius Ideas finely points to nature, "where various kingdoms *interpose* one another, so to speak, and mutually envelope each other. The kingdom of life is added to that of structure, the animal kingdom to that of life, the human kingdom to that of animality. But now we have reached the kingdom of God and that of the Son of God in humanity. All these successive genesis constitute in their totality the lofty dream of the earth. They are all repentance; and the more perfect the thing created the deeper is the repentance. Life is more hidden than matter; the animal is more enigmatic than organic life; man is more insurmable than the animal; Jesus is more impenetrable than all. He who would scrutinize the origins of things may grasp the material conditions in which beings are produced, but the first cause eludes his experiment. Whence comes matter? whence life? whence sensitive existence? whence being which thinks? whence genius? whence comes the Christ? The science which *confuse itself* within phenomena answers to these questions—I do not know! The reason which perceives causes replies—from the Spirit of God." Under what factual and historical form was the action of the spirit manifested in the genesis of Jesus? We are with the Gospel documents, the only pages in antiquity which touch us with any detail upon that event, concealed, almost unnoticed, which has yet succeeded in changing the face of the world. (*Jesus Christ*, L. II. c. 1. *Les Origines de Jésus*. Chap. II. *Sa Conception*. Tom. I. pp. 34, 35.)

speaks to the purity of a virgin. Yet if not a word too much is said for the delicacy of a maiden's ear, not a word too little is employed to indicate even the physiological process by which the Incarnation was effected. It is the 139th Psalm translated into one of the tongues of heaven. Yet not the less really is the material process summarised which had been so nobly prophesied in the psalm of the Incarnation.[1]

As a consequence of this Leading Idea it is natural that the evangelist should mark the successive stages in the early development of Him who was so wonderfully born. He is "conceived in the womb of Mary"; "the fruit of her womb"; "the Holy Thing to be born"; "her Son"; "the Babe"; "the Child"; "the Boy"; the Man of "about thirty years old."[2]

> Not conceal'd my substance was from Thee
> When in the secret covert I was made,
> Down in the dim depths of the under-world,
> Wrought with a manifold broidery divine.
> The germ that was myself Thine eyes did see,
> And in Thy book those things were written all—
> The days were ordained, ere a day had dawn'd.
>
> PSALM CXXXIX.

[1] ἐνεκυήσθη ἐν γαστρί (St. Luke i. 31). ἡ κοιλία τῆς μητέρας σου (ver. 42). ἔκκυνον τὸν τόκον αὐτῆς (ii. 7). τὸ βρέφος (ver. 16). παῖδιον (ver. 27). ἐστὶν ἄρρεν (ver. 23). The last passage to be noticed here—καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος (Luke iii. 23). Here ἀρχόμενος and ἦν are not to be joined—"Jesus was beginning to be about thirty years of age"—but taken thus = "and He himself, Jesus, on *beginning* His *ministry*, was about

(2) For St. Luke the Incarnation was also a *historical* reality. And this is a Leading Idea of the early part of his Memoir.

In this part of our subject we can do more than appeal to the opening verses of the Gospel.[1]

In the section now before us this reality is emphasized by a date which was intended to fix its place in the domain of history.[2] This is supplemented by other chronological marks which touch upon the records of several governments—and which, when compared with the statement of the Saviour's age, materially aid in bringing us to the period of His Birth.[3]

Still further. The Birth of Jesus as a matter of history derives confirmation from the general character of St. Luke as a grave chronicler. It is

thirty years of age." For the growth of Jesus in wisdom see Note C at the end of this work.

[1] ἀνωθεν, ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς (St. Luke i. 3). Of the three notions conveyed by the word καθεξῆς (*temporal*, *local*, and *logical*), the first is commonest with St. Luke, in whom alone among the New Testament writers the word is to be found. (St. Luke i. 3; viii. 1; Acts iii. 24; xi. 4; xviii. 23.) "St. Luke," says Tischendorf, "thus professes to write the Life of Christ with historical accuracy, *i.e.* preserving the order of events where it seemed necessary." There here confirm this interpretation: (1) that certain chronological marks are given by St. Luke alone (ii. 1; iii. 1-23); (2) that the narrative is made to fall into certain temporal limits, and especially, according to Jewish use, into weeks (*ἑβδομάδες*); and (3) that he occasionally intimates that the exact order is either unknown to him, or left undetermined by him.

[2] The taxing under Cyrenius. St. Luke ii. 1-3.

[3] St. Luke iii. 1-3, 23.

not merely that he claims this for himself in the three sober and sensible adverbs lately quoted. His modest claim is justified by the treatise which he evidently regards as the second part of his work—the Acts of the Apostles. We find in it an evidently careful use not only of oral information, but of *memoranda* and documents.[1] Now historical accuracy is not a capricious and intermittent impulse. It is a fixed habit of mind, the result of a particular discipline. Historians of the school of the author of the Acts of the Apostles are not men to build a flamboyant portal of romance

[1] We may refer to the letter of Claudius Lysias (Acts xxiii. 26-31); to the peculiar details and examples in the reports of the speeches of Demetrius and of the town-clerk (Acts xix. 23-41). The account of the voyage and shipwreck of St. Paul proves that St. Luke was a most acute and accurate observer, and a thoroughly careful and conscientious writer. "By a criticism of this kind," writes the bishop of Carlisle in reference to Mr. Smith of Jordanhill's work on the subject, "we pass by one step over the eighteen intervening centuries; and we are able to say, with a sense of absolute security, that the man who, in the anxiety and weariness of a tempestuous voyage, even in a week, was able to observe and remember with such demonstrated accuracy the incidents of his adventure, must be worthy of credit in any sense in which he pledges himself to have carefully investigated the facts that he records as true." See the masterly passage in *The Foundations of the Creed*, by the Bishop of Carlisle. (Pp. 126-127.) St. Augustine seems to have contemplated this specialty in regard to the history of the Birth. "Qui non solum . . . ea ceu ejus nativa, vel ab illis sub oculis sibi propositis, dicta et facta, commemorat; verum etiam, quæ prisquam Hierodiaconus ejus nasceretur, vel *infantiæ vel puerilis* . . . *in ea Ipso, sive a parentibus ejus*, sive a quibuslibet aliis, certissime indicta, et fabulosissimis commentis . . . penet humana sanctitate conversa."—(*De Consens. Evang.* Lib. I. Tom. iii. Pt. i. p. 1043. Ed. Migne.)

over the entrance to the austere temple of Truth. From what we learn of St. Luke in his later work we may be sure that he had authentic sources of information open to him, which cannot now be traced. Brief memoirs of many incidents may well have existed in certain families or assemblies. As regards "the Bethlehem narrative," we can scarcely doubt from what source the information was supplied. There is much which seems to reveal the head and heart of Mary. Mothers are the best biographers of their children. At all events we may be assured from what we know of him that St. Luke had authentic sources of information open to him; and that as he used such documents for occasions of much less importance, so he did not neglect them for the record of the most momentous events in human history.[1]

Such is St. Luke's first great Leading Idea of the Incarnation. It is a *reality*, *physiologically* and *historically*.

II

A second great Leading Idea is the *universality* of the Incarnation.

The remedy is not merely for the Jewish race;

[1] It is interpretive to notice the *analogy* influences which, in such an age, kept the narrative of the sacred Childhood well within the lines of ideal truth. A romance would have given us an obviously *superhuman*, *i.e.* an unhuman babyhood. The Apocryphal Gospels are an instructive object-lesson in the evidences of Christianity.

or for a selected few, the special favourites of heaven. It is for the whole diseased material of human nature; for all the sinful, the weary, the suffering; for the whole great army of the guilty and miserable in every land. That which the Son of God took into real union with Himself is humanity. Hence in the Gospel before us, Jesus meets all who cross His path with impartial sympathy. Hence, just before He leaves the earth, He commands His disciples to preach "repentance and remission of sins in His name unto all the nations."[1] Hence also the Gospel record of "all that Jesus *began* both to do and to teach,"[2] is the fitting prelude to a narrative which tells us of all which the ascended Jesus *continued* to do and to teach from heaven by the agency of His servants "in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth."[3] The Leading Idea of this *universal* Incarnation stands in the forefront of the *universal* Gospel. It finds a nobler and loftier expression in Simeon's song—"Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared[4] before the face of *all the peoples*[5]—a light

[1] εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. St. Luke xxiv. 47.

[2] Acts i. 1. [3] *Ibid.* v. 8.

[4] We may translate the Hebraising aorist into the concrete, and remember that "the salvation which Thou hast prepared" = "the Saviour whom thou hast prepared before the face of all the peoples." (St. Luke ii. 29, 31.)

[5] κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν. For the light thrown upon many passages by this Leading Idea the student may add the

unto the unveiling of the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people, Israel."[1]

III

A *third* Leading Idea in St. Luke's narrative of the Incarnation and Birth of Jesus is that it is *joyful*.

When the voice even of her who had conceived "the Holy Thing which was to be born" reached Elizabeth, the Holy Ghost filled her with a sweet surprise, and "the babe leaped in her womb for joy."[2] The angel of the Lord upon the first Christmas Eve struck the key-note, not only of the Incarnation prelude, but of the whole Gospel. "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy." As it begins, so it ends. "And they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy."[3]

IV

A fourth Leading Idea of St. Luke's narrative—and one peculiarly adapted for Gentiles, and especially for Greeks—is that it is *beautiful*.

St. Luke's is the painter's Gospel. And his

"unbelieves" (St. Luke xii. 46) compared with "the hypocrites" (St. Matthew xxiv. 51). The former was felt to be wanted in the Gentile Gospel.

[1] St. Luke ii. 30-33. [2] *Ibid.* i. 44.

[3] *Ibid.* ii. 10; xxiv. 52. *Cf.* 1 St. John i. 4. "These things we write that your joy may be fulfilled." The Christmas chimes are never quite out of hearing in the Church.

history of the great truth is placed in *idyllic* surroundings. So much so that sometimes it is more than insinuated that history never is idyllic; that its car is always drawn by common-place steeds through common-place scenery; that the music to which it moves may have a momentary pathos or romance, but never the sustained loveliness of a Pastoral Symphony.

St. Luke's is the poet's Gospel. Its beginning is interspersed with sacred canticles, with bursts of holy song. Fragments of noble liturgies may be detected more than once in the sequel of the narrative. But in the prelude of the Gospel the liturgical chant is heard at every turn. Every one remembers the words of Elizabeth, the plain song of the angel of the Lord, "the descant" of "the heavenly soldiers," and those three other effusions so familiar as the *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, and *Benedictus*.[1] The words of Gabriel, also, at the Annunciation, run into that parallelism which is the necessary form of Hebraic poetical elevation.[2]

These canticles, indeed, are specially appealed to by Strauss and Renan as proofs that the narrative is unhistorical. But the fact that they were *improvised* need produce no difficulty. For they were not composed under the difficult conditions either of classical or of modern poetry, restricted

[1] St. Luke i. 39-56, 25, 47-48, 67-80; ii. 10-18, 29-33.

[2] *Ibid.* i. 30-37.

by quantity and rhyme. Poetry is the impassioned rhetoric of the East. When the prophet is elevated by the glory or darkened by the terrors of the future; when his voice trembles with pathos or rises into indignation, his style spontaneously assumes the form of Hebrew poetry. We are told that poetry is neither extemporaneous nor epidemic. Our poetry fortunately is not; but our rhetoric (perhaps too frequently) is both one and the other. Given a receptive and sensitive mind, steeped in the style of the psalmists, and the awe mixed with rapture which must have been caused by such incidents if they really occurred—the production of such canticles becomes entirely credible, in the case of pious Israelites deeply penetrated by the sacred literature of their race.

Let us pause for a moment to consider whether we cannot find evidence in the context of some of these canticles that they belong to the time to which they are assigned, and can be referred to no other, without supposing an exquisite literary tact totally alien from apocryphal forgeries.

Take the hymn of Zacharias. What should we expect from him? The hope of Jesus Christ and of salvation, rising indeed a little beyond the Psalms, but still in Jewish colours, and under Jewish images. Precisely such is its character. The God whom Zacharias blesses is Israel's God. The mighty salvation is in David's house. It is

the fulfilment of prophecy in pursuance of the promise to Abraham.[1] The whole groundwork of the hymn is Jewish. The time is felt to be a dawn at best, "the day-spring from on high"[2] but there are vistas which let us behold the broad light upon the great deep.

Similarly with the songs of the Blessed Virgin and of Simeon. Our Church uses them as daily psalms, and applies them to Christ. But those who had seen the Incarnate Lord, who had beheld Him risen and ascending, would have spoken far more strongly. Their songs would have been more like "Rock of Ages," or "When I survey the wondrous Cross." They would not have been echoes of the harp of David, so much as of the harps of heaven—"Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God *by Thy blood*." "This hymn, if inconceivable earlier than Zacharias, is more inconceivable later," says Dr. Mill. Such sunlit mountain-tops in the distance with such mists over the path that lead to them; such a firm grasp upon salvation and redemption, such a clear view of its character as consisting in the "remission of sins,"[3] yet such silence as to its details; can only belong to the thin border-line of a period, which was neither quite Jewish nor quite Christian. A

[1] St. Luke i. 68, 69, 73. [2] *Ibid.* ver. 78.
[3] *Ibid.* i. 77. γνῶσις σωτηρίας ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. Colossians i. 14.

little less, and these songs would be purely Jewish; a little more and they would be purely Christian.[1]

St. Luke's idea of beauty (for a reason which has been stated at length[2]) includes also another element. It might now be called *visionary* and *mystic*, or a tendency to personify abstract conception. The third Gospel is throughout a Gospel of the holy Angels—*i.e.* we read more of their ministry, in connection with Jesus, than elsewhere. This is especially marked at the outset.[3]

These, then, are St. Luke's Leading Ideas of the Incarnation and Birth of Jesus Christ:—(1) The Incarnation is a *reality*—physically, with the conception, formation, and nativity of the Holy Child; historically, with a definite starting-point in time and place of a truly human life. (2) The Incarnation is a fact of *universal* import. "When Thou tookest manhood upon Thee to deliver it, Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb." The Redemption which issues from the Incarnation as from its vital principle is not partial and "particular." It is the fountain-head of a message addressed to every form of sin and misery in every land. It is the implied starting-point not only of the Gospel itself, but of the appended Church-history by the same hand which tells us how "the message going

[1] This argument was originally suggested by Dr. Mill's *Fourfold Theories of the Gospel*.

[2] Discussion iv. a, ii. 1.

[3] St. Luke i. 11-26, 35; ii. 9, 10-16.

forth from the upper-chamber, spread to temples, houses, streets, market-places, inns, prisons, camps, courts, chariots, ships, countries, cities, islands; to Jews, Gentiles, magistrates, officers, soldiers, eunuchs, prisoners, slaves, freemen, women, children, sailors; reaching finally Athens and Rome."[1] The Man is the fitting symbol throughout; it is the universal Gospel of the universal Incarnation. (3) The Incarnation is *joyful*. Its very idea is "good tidings of great joy." (4) The Incarnation is *beautiful*, with the beauty of an idyll, of a poem —with angels ascending and descending upon the Son of Man. The story which enshrines it has become part and parcel of the beauty of the starry night.

[1] BENGEL. *Gnom. Act. Apost. ad init.*

IV

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

E.

THE DANGER OF RICHES AND THE COMPENSATIONS OF POVERTY

"Yet lackest thou one thing; sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me."—ST. LUKE xviii. 22.

THE incident to which these words belong[1] is not peculiar to St. Luke, but common to all the synoptics.[2] This saying, however, gives a convenient starting-point for the consideration of one of the Leading Ideas of St. Luke—the dangers of money, and the compensations of poverty.

I

The danger of money forms one Leading Idea of St. Luke's Gospel.

[1] St. Luke xviii. 18–31.

[2] St. Matthew xix. 16–30. St. Mark x. 17–32.

The spring of a sweet aspiration after a new life came to this ruler of a synagogue, while yet young.[1] In the freshness of youth's enthusiasm he ran and knelt to the great Teacher.[2] His desires ran naturally from his training in two channels. He wanted a great Rabbi and a perfect rule. The dialogue ends in that stern, awful saying, "sell all that thou hast and distribute unto the poor—and come, follow Me." Then the vivid pencil of St. Mark shows us the gathering of a grey cloud upon the sunshine of the enthusiast's face. His countenance fell and lowered in a moment upon the word.[3] "He became exceeding sorrowful, for he was very rich."[4]

This passage is not a favourite with many preachers. They feel it necessary to explain away the Saviour's words, "if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."[5] They say very bitter things against the young ruler. He is a St. Sebastian, pinned through and pierced with the many arrows of evangelical pulpits. "He had not clear views." It would be strange if he had, as he was not a prophet. "He did not follow Christ." Who can answer for himself that he would have done so, at the time, and in the circumstances?

[1] ἀγραν. St. Luke xviii. 18. νεανίσκος. St. Matthew xix. 20.
[2] St. Mark x. 17.
[3] ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ (cf. for the word στυγνάζω ὁ ἥλιος. St. Matthew xvi. 3.
[4] St. Luke xviii. 23.
[5] St. Matthew xix. 17.

Jesus bent on him one of those penetrating glances which look into a man's being, and with it gave the young ruler His one love.[1] That love is not lightly bestowed, nor lightly taken away. It is a net with so many meshes; a voice with so many intonations; a finger whose divine subtlety touches so many springs and bolts of the door of the human heart. Perhaps one day the young man followed Jesus better and with fuller adhesion than he could have done at that moment. Perhaps he was one of those who only a little later sold[2] lands and houses, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the Apostles' feet,[3] so that "distribution was made unto each, according as any one had need."[4] Yet a little, and the seed of thought sown in his heart by the great Sower might come to maturity, so that he could say—"I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God."[5]

At all events, the danger of riches is shown in one of those immortal images which have passed into the common speech of humanity.[6] The illus-

[1] ἐβλέψας ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κτλ. (St. Mark x. 21.)

[2] ἀπαντῶν ἐφοβοῦν τοὺς τὰς κτήσεις κατέχοντας. (Βίοι τῶν ἁγ.)

[3] Acts iv. 34-38. The ἀνάθεμα of vrs. 35 answers remarkably to the ἐαθεν of St. Luke xviii. 22. [4] Galatians ii. 19.

[5] St. Luke xviii. 22. The expression is found in the Talmud and in the Koran. (Sup. vii. 38.) It was from ignorance of the Semitic idea that many Greek interpreters substituted κἀκείνοις, v. 19a. (See Renan. *Vie de Jésus*. Pp. 175, 176, n. 2. Cf. also St. Matthew xxiii. 24.)

tration is drawn from one of the common popular stories current in the East, which would be recognized by all. There were far-spread tales and legends of some enchanted city, with a gate of entrance which was a needle's eye. Among the applicants for admission was a rich merchant, riding on a camel, with its long neck and humped back, packed with precious wares. The rich man, who trusts in riches, fares like the merchant of the story. He cannot pass through the magic gate into the radiant city without the divine spell which makes him free of the land of the spirit.[1]

To this part of the subject we shall return at the close of this Discussion. But to prove that the danger of riches is one of the Leading Ideas in St. Luke's Gospel we need only at present point to two passages. St. Luke's version of the Sermon on the Mount has for its first beatitudes—"blessed be ye poor; blessed are ye that hunger now;" for its first woes—"woe unto you that are rich; woe unto you that are full." The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is peculiar to the third Gospel.[2]

[1] See the interesting pages in Lange—*Life of the Lord Jesus Christ*. Book 4, Part 3, § 35. (Vol. II. pp. 475-482. English Translation.)

[2] St. Luke vi. 20, 21, 24, 25; xvi. 19-31. On the section xii. 13-22, *see infra*.

II

This Leading Idea has for its completion the compensations of Poverty. The Jesus of St. Luke's Gospel has for the poor His tenderest words and sweetest promises. His mother offers the Purification of the poor. The first specific declaration of His teaching therein is that application of prophecy to Himself in the synagogue at Nazareth —"the Spirit of the Lord hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor." The first sentence of the other version of the Sermon on the Mount is—"blessed be ye poor." Those whom true disciples are counselled to invite are "the poor, the maimed, the halt, the blind, who cannot recompense them." The beggar is carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom.[1]

Believers in Christ try to render this compensation of poverty intelligible to Christian reason exercised upon social problems; and truly they *can* do so. Yet after all explanation a something always remains in His teaching about poverty,

[1] St. Luke ii. 7-24; iv. 18; vi. 20; xiv. 13; xvi. 22. The great Apostle, whom all antiquity so closely connected with St. Luke's Gospel, gives us a biography of Jesus in one word. It was one act of poverty (ἐπτώχευσεν, 2 Corinthians viii. 9). The New Testament gives us two more of these wonderful compressed *biographies* of Jesus—one, His outward life, with its ceaseless *activities* (διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν, Acts x. 38); one, His inner life, with its perpetual *self-denial* (οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, Romans xv. 3). One act of poverty, one act of benevolence, one act of self-denial!

which our generation keeps as far out of sight as possible. This generation has its ear and heart finely touched to hear the bitter cry of the "submerged tenth." Social Christianity, like moral philosophy, has a great proposition whose "categorical form" involves an "epitactic meaning:" "Poverty is blessed;" then "give alms." But have not even those who appeal to Christ's name most loudly grown afraid to tell the poor that, after all, their poverty, if rightly borne, has one special blessing—the smile and the promise of Christ?[1]

Two great dangers in money-making and money-holding are signalized by our Lord in St. Luke's Gospel, and help to bring out this Leading Idea.

1. The first great danger is the unresting and feverish absorption to which it leads.

When the man died who in the present generation had amassed the largest fortune which was ever made by advertisement of a popular medicine—leaving, it is to be added, a vast sum for public purposes—the chief organ of contemporary opinion printed a striking article upon the entire singleness of aim necessary for money-making on a grand scale.[2]

[1] Glad to be poor, because He loved the poor,
And made them wealthy with His word.
SIR E. ARNOLD, *The Light of the World*, p. 170.

[2] "Money-making is an art by itself; it demands for success the devotion of the whole men. Sleeping or waking his thoughts

With that article we may well compare the utterance of one of the most simple and transparent of human souls—

> Bear me, dear Lord! where'er Thou art—
> O never then from me depart;
> For to my soul 'tis hell to be
> But for one moment without Thee.[1]

There is something terrible in this *metallization* of spirit required by the process prescribed in the organ of the wisdom of the world. A wall so crowded can have no room for the image of Christ.

2. A second danger is *deterioration* of character. The soul becomes vulgarized. A want of consideration and sympathy disennobles the whole nature. Not seldom one who has been conspicuous for liberality in narrow circumstances becomes ungenerous, when suddenly transplanted into opulence. An offensive ostentation and sense of personal importance betrays itself in little traits of language which reveal character. To use vulgar but expressive words, such persons "stink of money."[2] must be devoted to it. . . . It was the life-work of a man who in no chance pun him. . . . It is not every one who is capable of such single-hearted attention as this. Most men wish to be wealthy, but . . . with a want of steadiness and singleness of purpose. . . . Politics or love are great things to them; they are not willing to give them up to just so many guineas by which the path of money-making is beset."—*Times* article on Mr. Holloway.]

[1] Bishop Ken.

[2] What a pompous sense of personal importance in the words of the Pharisee—πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι (St. Luke xviii. 12.) The Pharisees, as a class, were rich and envious.

This selfish, feverish restlessness is drawn in deathless and terrible lines by our Lord in an awful parable peculiar to this Gospel. The rich man, just before a death of violence,[1] held that dread dialogue in his own heart:[2] *Seven futures*, in rapid succession,[3] to show that such satisfaction as riches can give is always in the distance—then *six presents*, and all *selfish!* "So is he that layeth up treasure for *himself*, and is not rich for God."[4]

III

Yet with all this annunciation of the dangers of riches, there is absolutely nothing in St. Luke's Gospel which tends to show that money or property is an unlawful thing for a Christian to hold.

No doubt some of its burning phrases have been ingeniously formed into a theory which would land the Gospel in an exploded absurdity. "Luke," it is said, "is an Ebionite.[5] This strain was certainly

[1] vii. 20. "This night they are requiring thy soul from thee." The dialogue which was the terror of Galilee (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. v. 4, *Vita* 11) throws a fresh light upon the expression. (See Renan, *Vie de Jésus*. P. 174, n. 6.)

[2] διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ, vii. 17.

[3] τί ποιήσω—τοῦτο ποιήσω—καθελῶ—οἰκοδομήσω—συνάξω—ἐρῶ. *Ibid.* ver. 17–19. Then ἔρχου—πίε—φάγε—εὐφραίνου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου, ver. 19. Note the repeated personal pronoun τὸν σωρόν μου—μοι τὰ ἀγαθά—τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου—τὴν ψυχή μου, ver. 17–19.

[4] *Ibid.* ver. 21.

[5] So de Wette somewhere speaks of the "heresy of Luke."

in the original teaching of Christ. The traits even in Matthew are significant enough. But Luke, who held advanced communistic views, exaggerated the original. He wished to represent the Saviour as insisting that the poor, simply because they *were* poor, were invited to the banquet of the kingdom; that the rich man was to be cast into hell, simply because he *was* rich, well clothed, and dined well."[1]

The answer is obvious.

1. Our Lord very clearly shows that which is really dangerous in riches extends to the *poor* as well as to the *rich*.

There are two words rendered *covetous* in A. V. . . . One is simply "love of money."[2] The other word is more profound and far-reaching.[3] It is the desire of more and ever more—*moreness*, if we might coin a word. It is the craving to fill the chasm in the self with lower things; it is the character of one who is ever seeking more of them.[4]

[1] Renan, *Vie de Jésus*. Chap. x., xi. pp. 164–194. See Note A at the end of this Discussion.

[2] The *adjective* φιλάργυρος occurs only once in the Gospels. (St. Luke xvi. 14.)

[3] Πλεονέκτης. (St. Luke xii. 15.)

[4] Hence its connection with lasciviousness. 1 Corinthians v. 11, Ephesians v. 3.

The cloyed will,
That satiate yet unsatisfied desire, that tub
Both filled and running.

Cymbeline, Act i. Sc. 7.

It is clear that the disciples did not look upon our Lord's words to the rich young man as extending spiritually only to the rich. Their alarmed question is not "what rich man can be saved?" but "then who can be saved?" when they receive the loving explanation—"Children, how hard is it for them that *trust in riches* to enter into the Kingdom of God!" And this proves that they understood the saying, and are accordingly soothed by being pointed to the miracle of grace which saves rich and poor alike from covetousness. What we need to be emancipated from is not money literally and in itself, but the fallacy about money and possessions common to man. "Take heed and guard yourselves from all covetousness—for, not in the abundance which belongs to any man, not out of the things which he possesseth, is his true and very life."[1]

2. Our Lord teaches in St. Luke's Gospel that riches are not necessarily to be repudiated; so far from it, that rightly used they may add interesting to the joy of our future condition. Out of the mammon, whose characteristic is injustice and

Cf. Juvenal's—

"Lassata viris, nondum satiata, recessit."

Or. κλαυσίγελω, φιλογυμνῷ, are the few pregnant pagan, full of the quasi-universal sentiments of Archbishop Trench. (*Hymns of the New Testament*, § xx. pp. 78-81.)

[1] οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ. (St. Luke xii. 15.) The whole of this precious section is peculiar to St. Luke.

untruth, we may form friendships which will not terminate with life. "I say unto you"—not repudiate your riches, but—[1] make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles."[2]

Our Lord does not here teach that these friends purchase or gain for us an entrance; they simply receive us when we enter. Our names must be graven, not on the hearts of the poor saints, but on the hands of the Redeemer with the very nails of the crucifixion. "Make to yourselves *friends*." With money alone we can buy slaves, tools, flatterers. But with money alone we cannot buy a friend. Only he who *has* a heart can win a heart; only a heart-winner can be a friend-winner.

Riches rightly used, our Lord teaches, may be profitable for our higher interests.

3. Further. The true mind of Scripture is not in fragmentary texts splintered off from their context and crudely interpreted out of the medium in which they have their vitality. Outside the context of the history of the Church isolated texts, broken

[1] St. Luke xvi. 9. Mammon is scarcely proved to have been a Semitic god answering to Greek Plutus. The idea seems gradually to have been *hypostatised* in common speech (like the "almighty dollar" in America. *Cf.* ὁ ἐν ὁ κόσμῳ. Philippians iii. 19). The word is probably connected with the Hebrew אמן = that in which confidence is placed. (Does our Lord refer to this in St. Mark x. 24?)

from the pole, are like broken telegraph wires. Fanaticism runs like a ball of fire along these broken wires.

From the third Gospel we naturally proceed to the Church history by the same hand which is its sequel. The only communism of which we read, if more realized at all as a fact, was only momentary. The history of Pentecost is not "a charter of *sans-culottes*." The communism which it records was the Christian communism of the spirit, which is *ideal*: the divine delicacy and tenderness of sentiment, of heart and hand. The worldling's harsh and repeated assertion—"this is my private property, this is my own"—was scarcely translated by a single believer[1] into the new and beautiful language of heaven, in that atmosphere still electric with the presence of Christ, and marked by the traces of the Holy Ghost's steps of fire. A little later the Christians of Antioch sent relief unto the brethren that dwelt in Judæa, whose worldly means, perhaps, had been affected by the noble extravagance of Christian love.[2] A large contribution necessarily implies resources from which it can be given. Later on, again, a house of considerable size remains the property of its owner.[3]

[1] οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι. (Acts iv. 32.)

[2] Acts xi. 29, 30.

[3] Acts xii. 12. St. Peter's language is express. "Whilst the land remained, did it not remain thine own? and, after it was sold, was it not in thy power?" (Acts v. 4.)

On passing into the catacombs, recent discoveries prove that the Christian faith had penetrated into the higher classes of Roman society much earlier than had been supposed. Before the end of the first century noble or royal names—Cæcilii, Pomponii, Attici, Domitii—of high-born ladies and gentlemen, who had heard Apostles, or disciples of Apostles, are found in the crypts. The very walls and paintings on the stucco, with their finished and delicate arabesques, attest the opulence of the possessors. The Gospel, all quivering as it still was with a young life from contact with the Saviour and His disciples, had not startled those distinguished personages with any suspicion of communism.[1]

From these three facts—(1) that our Lord plainly taught that the chief danger to every man, poor as well as rich, is in a false view and wrong use of money; (2) because money, rightly employed, is capable of bringing special spiritual blessings; (3) because the very earliest Church interpreted the Saviour's teaching in this sense—we conclude that there is no communism in this Leading Idea of St. Luke's Gospel.

[1] *Les Catacombes de Rome*; par Gaston Boissier. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*. Tom. lix. pp. 170-175.) It will be noticed that the language of the Apostle (1 Peter iii. 3, 4) presupposes an atmosphere such as is breathed by fashionable ladies, surrounded by the refinements of rank and luxury.

IV

Let us not, however, after all close by explaining away the thought which is placed at the head of this Discussion. Christ looks right over His contemporaries. He feels that His voice has infinite volume. He can throw it where He will. Across the gulf of time, His eye looks at each of us. The good Physician still understands each case as He did on earth. And we are so different, one from the other. For most of us there are the allowed sweetnesses and tender commonplaces of home. We ripen for the grave through slow changes, until a husband's withered hand is laid in a hand which is withered too, and the child's last kiss is imprinted upon a white brow. Such lives may not only be happy but holy. Yet at times the sentences of Jesus sound dim, awful, and half understood, down the corridor, when the door is opened for a moment. "Sell all that thou hast and come and follow Me." "If any man come to Me, and hate not his father and mother—yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple. And whosoever shall not bear his cross, and come after Me, he cannot be My disciple."[1]

But there are cases in which He sees something peculiar—the stuff of which heroism and martyr-

[1] St. Luke xiv. 26, 27.

dom is made; the marble from which His hand can form the saint. From the cricket-field, from the struggles of the river, from the gaiety of the ball-room, from fair homes with the sustained stateliness of their daily life, He calls His own. He Who is so gentle half breaks their very hearts, takes from them the life of their life, that He may set the broken heart in His own way, and teach it the sublime joy of sacrifice.

And for promises—"treasure in the heavens."[1] Does that seem indefinite? Do we distrust things that lie in such azure distances, in such mystic depths? Nay, something more. He adds—"*in this time*."[2] For those who "have left their own,"[3] He seems to promise two things—a life ennobled, augmented, harmonized,[4] ties less vivid and passionate, but perhaps of almost equal tenderness.[5]

That call came from house to house in the "Umbrian movement" of the thirteenth century, to St. Francis of Assisi, and many others. It may come to some who read these lines—"sell all that thou hast,[6] and that instantly—talents, acquisitions, prospects, the intellect trained for and assured of success. "Distribute through and through," to the sick, to the ignorant, to the out-

[1] St. Luke xviii. 22.
[2] *Ibid.* ver. 30.
[3] ἀφένες τὰ ἴδια. *Ibid.* ver. 28.
[4] πολλαπλασίονα. *Ibid.* ver. 30.
[5] Read the whole of ver. 30.

cast, to the heathen—earth's poorest ones in the eyes of the true children of the Kingdom of God. St. Luke's Leading Idea of the teaching of Jesus Christ preserves much that tells of the danger of riches, much of the compensations of poverty, much that strikes to life a race of chivalry; an army of knight-errants of the Cross; while to every soul, in every case, He says, "Come, follow Me."

NOTE A

Our part of this statement of M. Renan's should be quoted as a characteristic specimen of his controversial method. The prophets established the closest relation between the words for "rich, impious, violent, wicked"; and on the other hand, between the words for "poor, gentle, humble, pious." See the Hebrew dictionaries in general, under the words—

אביון, דל, עני, עני, חסיד, שפל, פרוץ

M. Renan makes this remark apparently as an argument to prove that the Hebrew language was charged and saturated by the prophets with materials which could only end in such passionate exaggerations as those of St. Luke's Gospel. It is his doctrine that "language being for a man the very form of thought, the continued use of one language becomes for the people which is locked up in it a mould, a sort of strait-waistcoat."

"The prophets," he writes, "as true Tribunes, and, in one sense, the holiest of Tribunes," had established the closest relations between two classes of words. The "rich," in a transferred sense, = the violent, the wicked, and impious. The "poor" = the gentle, the humble, and pious. He adduces the words which follow to establish his assertion, and "refers us to the dictionaries."[1]

To the dictionaries let us go.

1. אביון.—This is the plene *originously expressed*. (Adjective, masculine nominative. But the root is *not poverty*, but *expression* (probably from אבה = to bend or be bowed), i.e. it is *essentially* the oppressed man, *secondarily* the poor man).

2. דל.—Is there any ground for attributing the conception of moral excellence to the דל? It appears to imply *misery*, not necessarily *virtue*. (Psalm lxxxii. 3; cciii. 7.)

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, pp. 180, 181, n. 1.

3. עני.—This word no doubt = pious man (Psalm xxxiv. 6). But this idea is linked with the spiritualizing effect of *affliction* rather than of *poverty* in particular.

4. שפל.—The notion is *depression, submission*, not specially *poverty*.

5. רעב.—Kind, pious. But the word seems not to have the most remote connection with *poverty* in any shape. The root is רעב = *eager, ardently desirous*. The רעבים seem to = the Maccabean worshippers of God. (The Ἀσιδαῖοι. Macrab. ii. 42, &c.)

6. צמא.—This word comes from צָמָא, to become rich, to be happy (as *beatus* in Latin). But if it has a *bad* moral sense (Proverbs xviii. 23) it is susceptible of a sense morally *indifferent* (Proverbs xxii. 7) or *good* (Proverbs xiii. 3).

7. חולשים.—This word has the idea of ostentation, noisy, arrogance—from חָלַל. This is a transfer of sensuous impressions to discursive moral attributes (like "loud" in modern English). Psalm lxxiii. 3; Isiv. 4.

8. קרע = Power as an object of *terror* to the *weak*.

Thus, eight Hebrew words are quoted to justify the assertion that the Hebrew language establishes no strictest relation between *poverty* and *piety, richer* and *impiety*; and we are referred to the "Hebrew dictionaries generally" under these eight heads. But upon inquiry it appears that of *only one* can the assertion be considered true in *any sense*; nor of any *one* of the words expressive of the *rich* is it *absolutely* true.

The language, then, had not been moulded into a dialect of communion by the Hebrew prophets; nor did it act as an exciter to our Lord's teaching upon the subject of riches and poverty. The Hebrew tongue was not a magazine of sociabilic explosives, nors to go off one day or other at the touch of a *non-sociabile* enthusiast or genius.

V

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

A

THE DIVINE GLORY OF CHRIST IN THE INCARNATION; THE SPIRITUAL ESSENCE OF THE MIRACLES, THE DISCOURSES, THE SACRAMENTS

"The Word was God, and the Word became flesh."—ST. JOHN i. 1–14.

I. THE opening sentence of each of the synoptics corresponds to the "standpoint" from which he views the earthly life of the Redeemer. St. Matthew begins with a genealogy which marks out Jesus Christ as the child of promise and prophecy; the son of Abraham and heir of David. St. Mark's Gospel is the development of the title in the first verse—"Son of God." St. Luke at once professes that he writes with historical accuracy,

and, when necessary, preserving the order of events.

The idea of the Prologue of St. John's Gospel is the Divine glory of Christ in the Incarnation.

A great life—a life whose words and works influence mankind profoundly—is not sufficiently told by merely relating its facts and dates. What an enigma, for instance, is the life of Napoleon! How many of his biographies are mere masks concealing those bronze features! We cannot understand any great and complicated life, good or evil, by merely recording the isolated events along which it moved. It is an organic whole, and must be reconstructed as such. That it is so with the life of Christ is confessed alike by Christians and by infidels. "In histories of this kind," says Renan, "the great sign that we possess the truth is to succeed in combining the incidents, so as to constitute a logical and probable whole. What we have to recover is not the material circumstance which has passed beyond our control; it is the very soul of the history. A great life cannot be rendered by a simple agglomeration of facts. A profound sentiment of its subject must embrace all, and bind it into unity." And the great Christian philosopher of the Middle Ages reminds us that a true Christology is the first and primary condition of a true theology.[1]

[1] "Circa quod, primum considerandum occurrit *de ipso Salvatore*."

This, then, is the great Leading Idea of St. John's Gospel. *Given* the facts of Christ's life, how shall we bind them into unity, and read them as a whole? What theory of His Person and Nature will give us a logical and consistent view?[1] We may not believe that the alleged facts are historical—but if we do so believe, how can we reconcile them? For, in this very Gospel we meet with contradictory facts. On the one hand, the peasant guest called to the marriage feast; on the other, the Divine giver of wine. On the one hand, the weariness by the wayside well on the hot September day; on the other, the sublime self-consciousness of Him who said—"if any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink." On the one hand, the thorny crown, and the form that elicited from Pilate the words of pity as well as admiration—"behold! the Man;" on the other, the majesty of the body which cannot be marred, which has between it and harm the great deep of type and promise—"a bone of Him shall not be

[1] The word *theory* may, of course, lead to grave misapprehension. A life written from a theory, or point of view, may become an *essay* in which metaphysics supersede history, a panegyric, a romance, a prose-poem, a mystic effusion. In modern language it may be an *ideological* treatise. And it is said that the fourth Gospel does, at if upon principle, subordinate historical sequence to the necessity imposed by the theory of the Word. The proof that indifference to historical veracity and its principles is the last charge which can be sustained against St. John as an historian, the writer ventures to refer to his *Epistles of St. John* (pp. 88–98).

broken."[1] Such are some of the antitheses of the great life, so nobly summed up by Keble:—

"Lo! He comes,
Hungry, thirsty, homeless, cold,—
Hungry, by whom saints are fed
With the eternal living bread;
Thirsty, from whose pierced side
Living waters spring and glide;
God and Sire He comes, Who never
Can put off His robe of light—
Homeless, Who must dwell for ever
In the Father's bosom bright."

In the Prologue to St. John's Gospel we have an answer to the questions suggested, a principle by which we may harmonize the facts of that life. St. John gives us a key which proves itself by fitting into all the wards of the lock. What Christ *did* and *said* becomes explicable only by knowing what Christ *is*.

Of the title—the Word—we remark that it unites two lines of thought—one scriptural, the other metaphysical. In Genesis, in the Psalms, in Proverbs and Isaiah, the Word or Wisdom of God seems, with increasing clearness, to be made personal, and connected with the Divine Angel. But further, the inspired thinker looks into the depths of his own mind, into the phenomena of *thought* and *language*. In the first he finds a faint type of the ontological relation between the Father and Son; in the second

[1] St. John ii. 1–11; iv. 7; v. vii. 37; xix. 2, 5, 37; xx. Exodus xix. 46; Psalm xxxiv. 20.

an illustration of the Incarnation.[1] By this great metaphysical conception (admired by Maine de Biran as sincerely as by Augustine), Scripture is illustrated in its depths. The Logos of Philo, abstract and impersonal, a mere Platonic ideal according to which God works, can only confuse us in dwelling on the Logos of John, who is a Personal self-existent Being.[2] The Son is the Word, because He has His Being from the Father. As a word is the formed utterance of the speaker's thought, He is the Word that the Father has outspoken into separate Personal Existence from the fulness of His Being.

Some who have not lost all reverence for Christianity speak as if St. John's Prologue added a

[1] See Dollinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. 235 *sqq.*; Bull, *Def. Fid.*

[2] The Word in St. John is opposed:

(a) To the Gnostic Word, created and impersonal.	88	(a) Uncreated and eternal. "In the beginning was the Word."
(b) To the Platonic Word, ideal and abstract.	88	(b) Personal and Divine. "The Word was God, He, Him."
(c) To the Judaistic and Philonic Word, the type and idea of God in Creation.	85	(c) Creative and Cause. "All things were made by Him."
(d) To the Doubtful Word, limitedly and partially instrumental in Creation.	85	(d) Unique and universally Creative. "Without Him was not anything made that hath been made."
(e) To the Doketic Word, impalpable and visionary.	85	(e) Real and permanent. "The Word became flesh."

difficulty for faith; as if St. Matthew or St. Luke on the Incarnation were comparatively easy to receive. Is it so for those who think? Place side by side these statements. On the one side—"when as His mother, Mary, was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost." On the other side those four oracular propositions—"in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And the Word was made flesh." Which is easier to receive? There have been profound intellects who have confessed that the statement in St. Matthew almost repelled them. But every fact has its factual and its ideal aspect.[1] In St. John the fact of the Incarnation is lifted up and flooded with the light of a Divine idea. If, in the Unity of the Divine existence, there be a Trinity of Persons; if the Second Person of that Trinity is to assume the reality of flesh, and the likeness of sinful flesh; we can, in some measure, see why He needed the tabernacle of a body, framed and moulded by the Eternal Spirit to be His fitting habitation. The mystery of a Virgin-Mother is the correlative of the mystery of the Word made flesh.

II. If we pass from this architectonic and presiding conception—to which St. John owes his title of *Theologus*, and his emblem of the eagle—we may

[1] Dr. Whewell. *Inductive Philosophy.*

conveniently trace the Leading Ideas of the spiritual Gospel under four heads—the miracles, the discourses, the sacraments, and the delineations of character recorded in it.

1. What is the Leading Idea in the miracles of St. John's Gospel?

The synoptical Gospels are full of miracles. The air is thick with them. It may be said that they are chiefly regarded as manifestations of Christ's power or evidences of His mission.

Now St. John, in his Gospel, certainly lays much stress upon the argument from miracles. Nowhere else is there a more frequent appeal to their weight as evidences. It is the Saviour's own assertion —"the works that I do bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me."[1] Yet in no Gospel are so few special miracles recorded. The turning of the water into wine; the healing of the nobleman's son, and of the impotent man at Bethesda; the feeding of the five thousand, and the walking upon the waters; the healing Himself, not as a timid man crouching behind the pillars of the Temple, but as God hides Himself in nature; the restoration to sight of the blind man; the resurrection of Lazarus; the going back and falling to the ground of the band who came to arrest Jesus; and the

[1] "The works which the Father hath given Me to accomplish; the very works that I do, bear witness of Me that the Father hath sent Me." St. John v. 36.

miraculous draught of fishes after the Resurrection, exhaust the list.[1] How are we to account for this?

There can be no rational doubt that St. John presupposes an acquaintance with, and so far bears witness to, the earlier evangelists. But there is another reason.

One miracle of each class is recorded, except that of which we read so much in St. Mark—the dispossession of demoniacs. Not that this last was foreign to his circle of ideas. He includes it in that triumphant sentence of his epistle—"for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil."[2] Indeed, it may be said without exaggeration that the notion of moral possession is peculiarly Joannic. "One of you is a devil. Ye are of your father, the devil. The devil having now put into the heart of Judas to betray Him. After the sop Satan entered into him."[3] But the one miracle of each class recorded by him is a type, a sacramental action, an "acted parable" a golden ray streaming out from His presence and opening up a line of light far into the kingdom of God. Some are so interpreted by the Saviour Himself. For instance, the feeding of the five thousand leads to the great discourse concerning the bread of Life. The restoration of sight

[1] St. John ii. 1, 11; iv. 46, 54; v. 2, 19; vi. 5, 21; viii. 59; ix. 1, 41; xi. 1, 44; xviii. 6; xxi. 1, 11.

[2] St. John iii. 8. [3] St. John vi. 70; viii. 44; xiii. 2, 27.

to the blind man teaches that He can coach the diseased eye of the soul, and let in the light upon "the unlit gulf of ourselves."[1] In other miracles, men, the least inclined to mysticism, have discovered a meaning of the kind. Thus Copleston and Whately[2] agree with Augustine in seeing more than meets the eye in the wine of Cana. It is a type and image of all the work of Jesus. In the Bible the Law passes by His word, into something grander, richer, at once sweeter and stronger. In our lives the world gives its best wine first; first romance and excitement, then the pleasure palling upon the jaded palate, and the wine of life upon the bitter and poisonous lees. But Christ reserves for His own grace upon grace, until, when the banquet is over, and the sacramental wine touches

[1] St. John iv. 32.

[2] Bishop Copleston's Sermon on the Marriage in Cana was published, along with several others, by Archbishop Whately in 1854, in a volume entitled *Remains of the Late Edward Copleston, D.D.*, &c. (J. W. Parker, West Strand, London). It is the eleventh sermon in the collection. The Archbishop's note to it is—

"There is something remarkable in the history of this sermon. The main substance of it had been stated to me by a friend who had been struck with a sermon he had heard in which this view was taken. I repeated this to Dr. Copleston, who was so much struck with it that he thereupon composed the following discourse, which I found him preach for the first time. From recollection of this, I afterwards myself wrote a sermon, which has since been published."

The late eminent (Dr. Fitzgerald) Bishop of Cashel, was good enough to furnish the writer with the information contained in this note; he believed the original of this chain of sermons to have been one by Saurin.

the lips for the last time, they can say to the Bridegroom of the Church—"Thou hast kept the good wine until now." Few Christians, indeed, would have much sympathy with the German Professor of Theology,[1] who when Augustine finds in the raising of Jairus's daughter, the widow of Nain's son, and Lazarus, the types of sinners variously dead in sin but quickened to the life of righteousness, accuses him of "trifling, ingenious gaps, and pretty enough, but equally unworthy of the dignity of criticism and of the sanctity of Scripture."

On the whole, it may be said that the miracles in the synoptics *teach* as well as *prove*, and that those in St. John *prove* as well as *teach*. But the main idea of the miracles in the three is to *prove*, while the main idea of the miracles specially recorded by St. John is to *teach*. To these especially are the words of Augustine applicable—"what our Lord did corporally, He would have understood spiritually. For He did not merely work miracles for the miracle's sake, but that the things which He wrought might be *true* to those who could understand them, as well as *marvellous* to those who beheld them. Our Lord worked miracles, to signify somewhat by those miracles, and that we should

[1] Clausen. *Augustinus S. Scripture Interpres.* (p. 153). Clausen gives some indication that the deeper view of the miracle of Cana would meet with his condemnation as solemn trifling. (p. 240.)

learn something more from them than simply that they were great, wonderful, and divine."[1]

The miracles in St. John, then, are viewed sacramentally and ideally.

2. The discourses of Jesus preserved in St. John.

The synoptical Gospels are full of parables. "It is above all, in parables," says Renan, "that the Master excelled. Nothing in Judaism had given Him the model of these exquisite pieces. He created it." An eloquent historian of the Church[2] writes—"Born in the ranks of the people, leading the public life so common under an Eastern sky, He addressed the multitude. When He was seen far off on the border of the lake, the masses gathered to hear from Him words at once sweet and strong, majestic and familiar; in the delivery of which He alternately pierced the soul with barbs of fire, and charmed the imagination by the touching grace of His parables." So characteristic of Him was this teaching, that St. Matthew *applies* to it the language of Asaph in the seventy-eighth psalm—"without a parable spake He not unto them, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open My mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world."[3]

[1] *Translation in Enon.* xii viii.

[2] M. Albert de Broglie. *Hist. de l'Eglise.* Tom. i., *ad init.*

[3] St. Matthew xiii. 34, 35; Psalm lxxviii. 2.

With this characteristic of our Lord's teaching in the synoptics before us, it is, perhaps, somewhat startling for a simple Christian to be reminded—as he sometimes is, in no subdued tone—that in St. John no complete and regular parable is preserved. Indeed, only two pieces with much external resemblance to the parables of the synoptics are to be found in the fourth Gospel—the comparison of the Good Shepherd, and that of the Vine.[1] Nay, the very word does not occur; for the term translated parable in our versions is in the original different.[2] Does truth, then, compel us to say to the reflective student—you must make your choice sharply? If you are a Christian, you must sacrifice a beautiful delusion to Him who will not be served by a lie. If your Lord spoke as Matthew reports, He did not and could not have spoken as John reports. You must surrender either Him who said, "I will give you rest," or Him who said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life"—either the Jesus of the synoptics, or the Jesus of John. A little consideration removes the difficulty.[3]

[1] St. John x. 1–6, 11–17; xv. 1–9.

[2] παροιμία. St. John x. 6; xvi. 25–29.

[3] It has been conjectured that in His more public addresses at Jerusalem our Lord may have used the common dialect Greek instead of Aramaic, for hearers whose circumstances had made them lose their Hebrew. But parables almost exacted a Hebrew investiture of language for their first oral utterance.

(*a*) The *circumstances* under which the discourses of Jesus in this Gospel were delivered are different from those in which the discourses in the synoptics occur. Every prudent teacher adapts himself to the taste and capacity of his audience. Indeed, the danger is that this complaisance should be carried too far. But there is an adaptation not unbecoming the wise and good. The gentle strain of teaching which breathes of flowers and birds, the mountain and the lake, is not suitable to bigoted theologians and rabbinical devotees living on the arid and stony soil of Jerusalem. The Great Bishop and Shepherd of souls reasons with Nicodemus, or with the Pharisees, in a strain very different from that which He adopts to the Galileans.

(*b*) Again; we find in this Gospel more words addressed to His own. Parables were not so fitting for continued instruction, addressed to those who were to go forth from His Presence to teach the world. Read the chapters from the fourteenth to the seventeenth. Those divine deeps with human emotions quivering on them like light upon the surface of the sea, that soliloquy of the High Priest, pleading with His Father, are absolutely peculiar to this Gospel, absolutely unique. Is it strange that the language which expresses them should be unique also?

(*c*) But, finally, if we have not parables in St. John, have we not evidence in the words of Jesus

there, of the tone of thought, which, under fitting circumstances, would create parables? What are the comparisons of the Shepherd and the Vine but parables in germ? Note how outward things are handled by the Master; with what associations He invests the water of the well, the bread with which He feeds the people, the light that falls upon the Temple at dawn, the grain of wheat, the vine, the sheep.[1] From what manner of mind should we expect parables? Surely from that to which nature is transparent, which in the noble words written by Southey for the monument of Butler, finds "in outward and visible things the type and evidence of those within the veil." If, then, in St. John's Gospel we find no parables expanded, we find a number of parables compressed.[2]

This seems to be a natural place for noticing one objection which has been confidently made against the historical truth of the Gospel. This objection is based upon the undeniable likeness between the language of our Lord in the Gospel, and that of St. John in his Epistles. Are we to

[1] "The things of earth
Are copies of the things in heaven, more close,
More clear, more near, more intimately linked,
More subtly, than men guess. Mysterious—
Finger on lips—whispering to wistful ears,
Nature doth shadow spirit."
SIR E. ARNOLD, *The Light of the World*, p. 171.

[2] St. John iv. 14; vi. 32–35, 49; x. 5; xii. 24; xv. 1–9; x. 1–17.

admit that we are forced to trace "the monotonous tone" of John's own style in the discourses, which can, therefore, lay no claim to historical accuracy? There are reasons which enable us to answer this question in the negative.

(*a*) The likeness between the style of the discourses and that of St. John is somewhat overstated.

The word Logos (which we meet in the Prologue of the Gospel, in the first Epistle, and in the Apocalypse[1]) is not applied by Jesus to Himself in any passage of His discourses. Hengstenberg argues, and apparently with reason, that *light* and *darkness* are used with different intentions in the Epistle and Gospel; signifying in the Gospel the region of salvation, and the awful tract beyond; in the Epistle moral good and evil. The doctrine of propitiation and purification by the blood of Christ is stated with less reserve in the Epistle than in our Lord's teaching in the Gospel.[2]

There are other differences for an attentive student, which belong to deeper characteristics of thought and style. He who has made an attempt really to master the Epistle of St. John, will have been struck by two peculiarities. (1) As we read, we find a collection of apparently isolated divine

[1] St John i. 1-15; 1 St. John i. 1; Apoc. i. 2; xix. 13.

[2] Cf. 1 St. John i. 7, with St. John iii. 16.

γνῶμαι, of sentences generally short, and almost lapidary, in their strong simple incisiveness. These sentences superficially seem to be quite disconnected. Yet a connection there is, spiritual rather than logical, ethical more than intellectual, real not verbal. (2) A second characteristic is that, in passage after passage, the eagle of God seems to wheel round and round favourite thoughts. But it will be found that there is a perpetual line of advance, not mere spiral revolution. There is parallelism; but not the "mere monotonous parallelism, the cycloidal composition and eternal tautology," with which the expression of Hebrew thought has been charged by Herder. It is a parallelism, or *opposito cum accessione*, as critics have expressed it.[1] To take one instance out of many, "He that hateth his brother is in darkness even until now." Then—"he that hateth his brother is in darkness." Now note the accession to the parallelism, giving a solemn eloquence to the close of the verse, "he is in darkness," his inward condition—"and walketh in darkness," his outward life—"and knoweth not whither he goeth," to what unsuspected guilt, to what unsurmised punishment. Something worse still—worse than darkness around, above, within. "The darkness blinded him once for all; he has lost the very faculty of sight."[2]

[1] See Reiche, *Comment. Critico*, tom. iii. *in loc.*

[2] ἐτύφλωσεν. 1 St. John ii. 9, 10, 11.

It may be asserted that neither of these peculiarities is anything like so marked in the discourses of our Lord in the Gospel.

(*b*) The opening words of the first Epistle show us that St. John would have found an insuperable moral objection to placing discourses in the mouth of Jesus. "That which was from the beginning, which we have *heard*."[1] This at once recalls to us, the words of Jesus, more especially His discourses in St. John's Gospel. The very place of this clause in the sentence, where *hearing* stands out above *sight* and *handling*, shows us the reverence with which he regarded the words of the eternal Word. It shows us that he would have shrunk from the profanity of turning his Gospel into a fiction or a drama, and inventing language for the Incarnate Wisdom of God.

(*c*) But, if the similarity between the style of the discourses and that of the Epistle is *exaggerated* by many, it is, at least, after all deductions, very *remarkable*. And, if we reject with indignation, on behalf of the Apostle, the supposition that he would invent language, and place it in the lips of his Master; can we find a satisfactory solution of the difficulty?

Assuredly we can.

Christ, in the days of His flesh, expressed His divine knowledge in words. In His teaching there

[1] 1 St. John i. 1.

were two elements, referred to by Himself in the antithesis—"if I have told you of *earthly things* . . . if I tell you of *heavenly things*."[1] "Earthly and heavenly" is not equivalent to easy and difficult. But "heavenly" comprises dogmatic objective truths, connected with the nature of God, and the counsels of His grace. "Earthly," again, assuredly does not mean earth-born or carnal.[2] To that soul whose home was beyond the stars, in the bosom of God, things which seem to us the most heavenly, are on earth after all.[3] They are of heaven indeed, from heaven, even now, on the line which seems to blend with the heaven beyond.[4] But they have for their subject-matter the teaching of truth, not as it is in itself, but as it meets with a creature like man, as it is capable of being morally tested and experienced by us. Others, then, recorded those words, which rather belonged to the circle of "the things on earth," or which made a greater impression at the time of their delivery. The Sermon on the Mount, spoken upon a height in Galilee to a great assemblage, sank into a thousand hearts, and found its way into the earliest memoirs. The conversation with Nicodemus by night, the dialogue

[1] St. John iii. 12.

[2] "The word is ἐπίγειον, not γήινον.

[3] ἐπίγειον.

[4] "In margine coll." BENG. *in loc.*

with the Samaritan woman, the discourse in the Temple, would not lie so near the surface of Christian recollection.

Of these two elements, then, in the teaching of Christ, there was one with which the mind of St. John had a constitutional affinity. He appropriated "the heavenly things." They sank into his soul. They were taken up into the substance of his intellectual and spiritual being. Those who have been much with the great masters of thought and language, though only through the medium of their books, show by their words and ideas the high company which they have been keeping. Tennyson, Browning, and Arnold impose the very faults of their diction upon a generation of poetasters. A very thoughtful theologian wrote:—"I trace so distinctly to Bishop Butler the origin of the soundest and clearest views that I possess upon the human mind, that I could not write upon this, or any kindred subject, without a consciousness that I was directly or indirectly borrowing largely from him."[1] Common studies and schools and tutors impress subtle similarities of literary form and colour. Modern Oxford men are liable to sudden conversions, and are drifted to havens upon the most distant shores of thought. But there is the old trick of voice. "Coelum non animum mutant."

[1] Bishop O'Brien, Preface to *Three Sermons upon the Human Nature of our Lord*.

The autobiography of the Oxford politician has, curiously, likenesses to the *Apologia* of the Oxford Oratorian. But much more is this the case, where the charm of personal influence is added. "I may be allowed," says an eloquent writer, "to take this opportunity of claiming, once for all, for the pupils of Arnold, the privilege and pleasure of using his words, and adopting his thoughts, without the necessity of specifying, in every instance, the source from which they have been derived." [1] Those who, nearly half a century ago, on Sunday afternoons used to listen with spell-bound interest to the calm, sweet voice of the Rev. Mary's; who told us of

> —"His misery's signs,
> And how the dying spark of hope was fed,
> And how the heart was soothed, and how the head;
> And all his hourly varied anodynes"—

will sometimes find a phrase, a word, a sentence coming to their lips or falling from their pen—or hear them in the sermons, and recognize them in the writings of others, which they can trace to a teacher, from whom they are now separated by a vast space of the spiritual world.

We have freely used analogies, drawn from our own days, and from men not long since living, because they may enable us to feel more vividly how probable it is that the style of St. John should

[1] Dean Stanley. Preface to *Essays on the Apostolic Age.*

he like that of the discourses in the Gospel. Remember that the disciple was John, and the Master Jesus. Those favourite words—"light and darkness, life and death, love and hate, truth and lie, world and abiding"—were not terms which he had taught himself to apply to the designation of his own ideas. He had heard them in the long golden hush of the summer evenings by the shore of the Lake of Galilee; in the sorrow of the guest-chamber; between the brook of Kedron and the garden of the Agony; during the days when the Risen Lord spoke to them "of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." He had not only enshrined them in his memory. He had made them so livingly his own, had appropriated them so profoundly, that he could use them with unerring precision and definiteness. Expressions which occur in the Gospel historically and occasionally were taken into the Apostle's soul. No longer as it were in block, but rounded and smoothed like stones by the continual friction of the water, they appear in the Epistles, in a sententious, aphoristic form. "Is it John, the son of Zebedee," it has been asked, "who could write these lessons of abstract metaphysics, to which neither the synoptic nor the Talmud present any analogy? Certainly, for he had heard them from Christ. In once instance, at least, he shows that he knew words previously recorded in the synoptics. "Jesus Him-

self testified that a prophet hath no honour in his own country."[1] Sometimes we can see that the thought latent in an expression in the synoptics, is present to him. "He spake of the Temple of His Body."—"He dwelt among us,"[2] are but commentaries upon the sentence in St. Matthew—"there is something here greater than the Temple."[3] The synoptical Jesus teaches nothing, we are told, but morality,—the Joannic nothing but theology and metaphysics. What shall we say to such texts as these—"all things are delivered unto Me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "If David call Him Lord, how is He his Son?" "I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth."[4] Have not these sentences of Jesus in the synoptics the same ring with the highest utterances in the spiritual evangelist?

We may conclude without hesitation that John did not give language to Christ, but Christ to John.

3. We proceed to consider the Leading Idea of St. John's Gospel in the sacraments.

In the earlier evangelists their institution is re-

[1] St. John iv. 44. Cf. St. Matthew xiii. 57. St. Mark vi. 4. St. Luke iv. 24.

[2] ἐσκήνωσεν, St. John i. 14; ii. 21.

[3] τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων ἐστὶν ὧδε. St. Matthew xii. 6.

[4] St. Matthew xi. 27; xxii. 45; St. Luke x. 21.

corded very fully. It is omitted in St. John. Why is this?

(*a*) It is true, and so far perfectly satisfactory, to answer that this Gospel was written considerably later than the others. The Church was fully organized. It enjoyed its weekly celebration. It knew of the institution of the Eucharist, not only from the three synoptics, but from the special revelation made to St. Paul.[1]

(*b*) But the answer which it is the privilege of the Church's children to give, is deeper and more blessed than this, however valid it may be for apologetic purposes. St. John *does* treat of the sacraments.

Can we doubt it? The sacred history and ritual observances of the Jews, even ecclesiastical institutions of later date, are transfigured and glorified in this Gospel. Jacob's ladder, the Temple, the serpent in the wilderness, the manna, the Paschal lamb, the beautiful ceremonial of drawing water in golden pitchers from the fountain of Siloam at the Feast of Tabernacles in remembrance of the water gushing from the rock,—all these are spiritualised and idealised in St. John's Gospel.[2]

And again, the Apostle's heart is so full of sacraments, that in his Epistle he treats them with

[1] 1 Corinthians xi. 23.

[2] St. John i. 52; ii. 21; iii. 14, 15; vi. 49; vi. 32, 35; vii. 37, 40.

a mysticism, which is not dark to those who love. "There are Three that bear witness, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood."[1] Of these Three the Gospel is full, section after section. John speaks of a trinity of testimony on earth, the three "genuine witnesses;"[2] "the shadow of the Blessed Trinity in heaven" of which he thought, but—so far as our evidence extends—did not *write*. And what is that testimony? "The water"—and the water of which the faithful know is that for the mystical washing away of sin. "The blood"—the Atonement, and the cup by whose wine we are partakers of it. "The Spirit"—the one Baptizer, the one Consecrator, for "by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink into one Spirit."[3] With these considerations before us, we shall not rob the Gospel of St. John of its sacramental jewels. The words of Jesus in the third of St. John, addressed to an age full of baptismal ideas, can have but one meaning. No critical ingenuity, no "licentious alchemy" of interpretation can ever prove that *water and the Spirit* are equivalent to the *Spirit without the water*. So with the sixth chapter. There may be, and there are, objections to making our Lord's discourse there *exclusively* sacramental. But to sever it

[1] 1 St. John v. 7, 8.

[2] Lightfoot. *On Revision*. P. 25.

[3] 1 Corinthians xii. 13.

from the sacrament, to make it unsacramental, is contrary even to common sense. It is impossible that the Apostles should not have been reminded of it, when the Holy Communion was instituted. It is impossible not to think of the Eucharist, as we read it now. It has been said by the most evangelical of commentators, "that Jesus intentionally so framed His words, that—while they treated at once and for ever of the spiritual fruition—they yet fitted into the august mystery of the sacrament when it was ordained, and which He evidently had in His mind."[1]

In this Gospel, then, St. John treats the sacraments as he has treated so many other things. He spiritualises nature, history, ritual, miracles. But to spiritualise is not to evaporate, to "subtilise into a metaphor." He spiritualises Baptism and the Eucharist. That is to say, he shows us their ideal side; he lights them up from above and from within.

We may put the same truth in another form by saying that *Water* is a Leading Idea of the fourth Gospel.

So long as St. John's Gospel lasts the *water* must "ever bear witness."[2] There is scarcely a paragraph of it where water is not mentioned, generally with some relation to Christ. The Jordan

[1] Bengel.

[2] τρεῖς εἰσὶν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες.—1 Ep. 1 St. John v. 7, 8.

itself bears witness as it rolls that all its water cannot give that which is bestowed by Him who "was before" the Baptist. The water that was made wine testifies to His glory. The birth of "water and of the Spirit" is His witness, age after age. In section after section, we have the same Leading Idea. The water of Jacob's well,—of the pool of Bethesda; of the stormy lake upon which He walked, or outpoured at the Feast of Tabernacles; the water of Siloam; the water poured into the basin, when Jesus washed the disciples' feet; the water which flowed from the riven side upon the cross; the water of the Sea of Galilee, when Jesus showed Himself on its beach to the seven; as long as this is read in the Gospel, so long water must be recognized as one of its Leading Ideas[1] Water, literal water, is everywhere. He loved it from the associations of his early life, and for the mention made of it by his Master.[2] And of all writers in the world, St. John is the least likely to have joined without necessity, an external and material object with the Spirit. Never would he have written—"except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit" —unless Jesus had expressly joined the two. The

[1] See John i. 16, 19, 31, 33; ii. 9; iv. 46; iii. 5; iv. 5, 7, 11, 12; v. 1, 8; vi. 19; vii. 38, 37; ix. 7; xix. 14; xix. 34; xx. 1-8. It is interesting to note that water is constantly used in the other great book which the Church believes to be from St. John. (Apoc. vii. 17; xiv. 7; xxi. 6; xxii. 1-17.)

[2] See Brandes. *Life of Christ.* P. 187.

inner meaning is that St. John's reverence for Baptism sanctified, in his estimation, all the waters of earth.[1] Even so, for the sake of the Eucharist, every vine was a hallowed type, and all bread a sacred thing.[2]

[1] *Cf.* μὴν τὸ ἅλας ἀπόλεσε τὴν. Acts x. 47. The writer ventures to refer to his *Epistles of St. John*. Pp. 28, 29, 226-228.

[2] The "magic significance" (to use Lange's words) of the Jewish feasts in the life of our Lord is certainly a Leading Idea of St. John (ii. 13; v. 1; vi. 4; vii. 2, 37; x. 22; xi. 55; xiii. 1; xviii. 28, 39; xix. 31).

NOTE A

No thoughtful Christian can fail to have been struck by the fact that, except these few words which our Master "with His finger wrote upon the ground," He wrote nothing. He did not bow down over a table piled with manuscripts, and in hours of meditative thought during which He outwatched the stars erect a monument which might be admired by a succession of sages and critics. He did not write out the complete text of an elaborate system of theology. He went forth into the throng of men. He spoke by the highways and the hill-side, in words which, if they were high as heaven and deep as the transparent lake, were in form broad and popular. When we consider the analogy of the "tables that were the work of God," and of "the writing that was the writing of God," and the value of books in catching error and securing permanence—we ask why did He not write? There is one reason, derived from His nature. In great books the most element of greatness is the conviction that we can trace the pathway of a superior mind in pursuit of truth. When such a writer comes to the close of prolonged labours, he can utter his *heureka*—I have found the truth. *He does not say*—I have *found* the truth. He *does* say—"I am the Truth." We may answer the question why *Jesus* did not write, with the philosopher of the Middle Ages. The thought of Jesus is preserved in a divine way, according to the great promise—"I will put my Law in their mind, and write it in their heart." That which He has done by the members was virtually done by the Head. It will be seen that, in this sense, the Gospels themselves may be looked upon as part of His teaching.

fecus wrote no book.—See Neander. *Life of Christ*, p. 104. The whole question is well discussed by Thomas Aquinas.

"*Summary.*

"It might seem that Christ ought to have written: for—

"1. Writing is best for an immortal doctrine. St. Luke xxi. 33.

"2. The analogy of the Old Law. Deuteronomy xxiv. 1; xxxii. 16; xxxi. 18; xxix. 12.

"3. More complete exclusion of error.

"4. Avoidance of misrepresentation. Some are wont to be surprised because the Lord Himself wrote nothing, so that we must believe orders proceeding of Him. This is especially said by the sins of Pagans, and of others, who will not openly blaspheme, and who allow Him surpassing wisdom, but simply as Man. They say that the disciples gave Him more than His due, so as to call Him God.

"Yet it is matter of fact that He wrote nothing.

"*Answer.*

"1. The more excellent mode suited the most excellent Teacher. *Cf.* St. Matthew v. 1, viii. 28. The analogy of Pythagoras and of Socrates who wrote nothing.

"2. The most excellent doctrine cannot be stamped into books. *Cf.* St. John xxi. 25. (St. Augustine says—'lest that there would not be local room, but *capacitate ingenium comprehendi non posit.*')

"3. Due order through disciples to people. Mystical reference to Proverbs iv. 3.

"4. Again.

"5. What was done by the members was done by the Head. *Quæ facit per alium facit per se.*

"6. The old law might be written, but 2 Corinthians iii. 3.

"7. Those who believed not Apostles would not have believed Christ."

Cajetan adds some good thoughts, showing how this was more worthy of Christ's divine glory.

"Christ teaches, *like God*, not by writing. Analogy of God's mode of teaching natural things.

"Jeremiah xxxi. 33. He will prove His doctrine one of spirit and life, not of death and the letter. Christ, knowing that this internal teaching was reserved to Him as Lord, committed not His writing to paper, as if the doctrine must perish if the writing were lost, which He would preserve for ever by the inward light of His Spirit."—D. THOMÆ. *Summa Theologica, cum Comment. Cajetani.* Quæst. xlii. art. iv. Tom. iv. f. 142.

Mr. Latham shows, with much vigour and clearness, what advantages ensue from the Gospels "being narrative instead of didactic, and coming from the evangelists instead of from Christ." He also powerfully sets forth the evils which might have arisen from bondage to the letter. *Pastor Pastorum.* (Pp. 13, 14.)

V

THE LEADING IDEAS OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

B

IN DELINEATION OF CHARACTERS; IN THE GROWTH OF BELIEF AND UNBELIEF; IN RECORDING WITNESS TO CHRIST

THE great Leading Idea of the fourth Gospel is the Divine glory of Christ in the Incarnation. It has, also, its own Leading Ideas about the miracles, the discourses, and the sacraments.

We proceed to consider other Leading Ideas.

I

In the delineations of character.[1] The profoundest thinkers, the most deeply reflective men, are not always the acutest observers, or the most

[1] This is also a leading characteristic of St. Luke. *[supra, iv. B, (ii.)]* But the two evangelists produce their results by a different process. St. Luke describes the character by some delicate psycho-

judicious critics of individual character. Jesus alone both knew all men—the infinitely delicate traits which distinguished one from the other, the individual souls who crossed the pathway of His life on earth—and also "knew what was in man," in our collective humanity.[1] St. John, "the Plato of the twelve," as he has been called, appears to have been endowed with some reflection of the power to read men as well as man. As we pierce through the mists of the past; as we try to give form and features to those whose ideal lineaments we have seen so often on the painter's canvas, or glorified by the sunshine in the cathedral-window; as we bring before us the Incarnate Lord, and the company by whom He was surrounded; we find that we owe yet more to St. John than even to St. Luke. The transparent simplicity of Nathanael; the noble humility of the Baptist; the sensual nature of the Samaritan woman; the rude blunt-ness of the blind man; the yearning of Philip; the

logical touch, or by the course of the narrative, or by preserving some word of insight spoken by the Master. St. John lights up the life and character more dramatically by some word spoken at a critical time of a man's life by *himself*, in some way containing a revelation of the inner being, of its attitude and purpose. St. Luke's delineation of character is *didactic*, St. John's *dramatic*. (St. Luke ii. 19-51; v. 9; viii. 47; x. 40; xi. 53, 54; xix. 4, 10; xxiii. 8-11; St. John i. 42-45; iv. 18; ix. 8-41; xi. 36; xii. 21; xiii. 9; xiv. 5; xvi. 17, 18; xx. 28, 29; ix. 36, 38; xi. 21-27; xii. 21; xiii. 9; xiv. 5 (cf. xi. 16—Thomas's character self-painted in two sentences of his own); xii. 28.

[1] St. John ii. 24, 25.

passionate tenderness of Magdalene; the weakness of the sceptical Pilate; the contrasted characters of Judas Iscariot, of Peter and John, of the Judas who was not Iscariot; the melancholy of Thomas, doubting just because he loves: all these we owe, wholly or in part, to St. John. One really cannot sympathise with those who complain of the perpetual iteration and monotony of St. John. When a man accusses the Alps or the ocean of monotony, we may fairly suspect that there is a deficiency in himself. But while each character is individually true, each also is a type of a class, with permanent and universal features.

High above all is the figure of the Saviour, as St. John would have us see it. The power of that representation may be faintly illustrated by comparing one portion of St. John's narrative with the device whereby a painter has striven to represent it. We turn to the discourse of the guest-chamber. A great artist wishes to combine the divine melancholy and divine peace; the exquisitely blended joy and sorrow; the majestic sweetness of the "peace I leave with you," with the reproachful sadness of "ye shall leave Me alone." But he finds that he has no materials by which he can present to us simultaneously the deepening shadow of the human anguish, and the fulness of the sustaining love. And so just above the Lord reclining at the table a window is opened; and through it faintly

and dimly are suggested rather than sketched Gethsemane, as it was an hour or two later—three sleeping forms and Another that kneels, and a winged shape flitting through the night towards the olives, with a cup in his hand.[1]

We may, perhaps, best be able to bring out St. John's peculiar power of delineating character by directing our attention to his representation of the Baptist.

Before doing so we may just remind ourselves by a brief quotation from Eusebius that St. John refers to the synoptical books.[2] "After the fasting "and temptation Matthew shows us the chronology "of his book, saying—'now when Jesus had heard "that John was cast into prison, He departed into "Galilee.' " So Mark and Luke in the parallels.[3] "It is said that on account of these things, the "evangelist John, having been asked to relate in his "Gospel the time passed over by the three former "evangelists in silence, and the things done in it "by the Saviour (*i. e.* the things *before* the imprison-"ment of the Baptist), gave his assent; first by "writing—this beginning of miracles did Jesus'—

[1] These sentences were written with a lively recollection of a beautiful article in the *Spectator*, which appeared probably in 1860.

[2] De Wette and Dollinger have gone so far as to say that the reference is intended as a *correction*.

[3] St. Matthew iv. 12; St. Mark i. 14; St. Luke iii. 20; St. John iii. 14-31.

"then by mentioning the Baptist as even then "baptizing in Ænon near to Salim.' And he "shows this distinctly by saying—'for John was "not yet cast into prison.'"[1]

What is the originality of the Baptist's character even in the synoptics? Not the ascetic garb and fare. Herein he did but profess to imitate Elijah. Not "bodily rebuking vice." Elijah and Micaiah stood up as bravely to Ahab. Not even "patiently suffering for the truth's sake." The mutilated body, "stretched upon the threshold of Christianity," only marks the *via dolorosa*, over which the whole army of martyrs have passed to their crown.

It is to something else that we must look as constituting his originality.

The world recognizes jealousy as the chief weakness of popular leaders and preachers. Such men are spiritual athletes who cannot bear a rival. The greatest of popular preachers, the darling of Antioch and Constantinople, admits that he who can overcome this is almost like the disembodied spirits, whose lives, pure as the crystal stream, can never be darkened by any shadow of envy, or vainglory, or other sickly or unworthy passion.[2] But the leader of a great movement, who, the founder of a sect,

[1] St. John iii. 11; iii. 23, 24. Euseb. Pamph., *Histor. Eccles.* iii. 24. *Cf.* Theophan. *Synopsis Evangg.* xxiv., xxvi.

[2] *οἱ μὲν γὰρ, ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ ἀνυπόστατοις διαβόλοις οὐ μόνον ἀθάνατοι, μόνον δὲ ἀμῆ ἔφυν, μόνον δὲ ἀνέφελοι τὴν τοιαύτην ἀφίασι νοσήματα.* S. Joann. Chrysost. *De Sac.* v. 8.

which has vitality enough to live on for years; who was possibly even regarded by some as Messiah, when St. John presided at Ephesus—that he should have bowed down in prostrate humiliation before a younger successor, this is original indeed.

The Baptist was distinguished by strength, independence, purity.

By strength. If ever there was a man unlike the little reed that gives itself to be tossed[1] by the wind, it was the Baptist. Your strong man is self-conscious. He has presided over the slow and painful elaboration of his character. He has looked on with satisfaction at the stiffening of his moral fibre into steel, and knows what it is worth. "Humility," it has truly enough been said, "has never been a feature of strong Jewish natures." Yet this strong man says—"He that cometh after me is *stronger* than I."[2]

Independence is another of his characteristics. Yet, like David in God's presence declaring "I will be base in my own sight," so the Baptist exclaims, "Whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose."[3]

Above all the Baptist was *pure*. An effective moral teacher must "in purity of manhood stand upright." Never could he have brought men to repentance, if he had not himself repented. The

[1] σαλευόμενον. St. Matthew xi. 7. [2] St. John i. 27.

[3] λύσαι τὰς ἱμάντας.

words "generation of vipers" would have been a mere scream of impotent rage, if he had not crushed the serpent in his own heart. Yet, in the presence of Jesus, that pure soul seems black like the waters of a mountain-lake in the neighbourhood of the newly-fallen snow. The baptism of water he knew; of the baptism of fire, searching and sifting to the marrow, he recognized the need—"I have need to be baptized of Thee."

This abnegation it is which is so thoroughly original. Nothing in the Baptist's early life can account for it. Only sons, like the child of the aged Zacharias, are not commonly very unselfish. It ill becomes us, lounging in our easy chairs, the "heirs of all the ages" in cookery and scientific comfort, to sneer at asceticism. But unnatural humility in one direction is sometimes made up for by unnatural pride in another. The haughtiest of the sons of men have worn haircloth next their skin, and lived upon fare less delicate than locusts and wild honey. The solution is not given by Renan, when he says—"there is no other instance of the chief of a school receiving, with prostrate humility, the man who is to succeed and to eclipse him. But the Baptist was of the same age as Christ, and very young according to the ideas of the times—and youth is capable of any abnegation." One knows not what young men will think of the interesting quality thus ascribed to youth. Those who are

older probably agree with Aristotle, who tells us in his *Rhetoric*, that "the young are fond of honour, or rather fond of victory; for youth desires superiority," and that "young men are high-souled." He adds the reason with profound truth. They are not permanently subdued by the humiliating discipline of life.[1]

We have dwelt upon this central characteristic of the Baptist at some length, because the way in which it is grasped by St. John illustrates one peculiarity of his Gospel. All his delineation of the Baptist brings out this note of his character (of course in measure perceived by the synoptics) with increasing clearness—"he confessed and denied not, but confessed I am not the Christ;"—"behold the Lamb of God;" "He must increase, but I must decrease."[2] It is the Baptist's picture seen in the light of his utter self-abnegation.[3]

As in the case of this delineation of character, so it is with all others in this Gospel. The portraits

[1] καὶ μεγαλόψυχοι· οὐτε γὰρ ἐθέλει τὰν ἄλλω τιν ὑπεκφεύγοντα ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀντιμαχόμενον ὑπερφέρειν κόσμον, καὶ τὸ αἰσχυνθὲν αὐτὸν μεγάλων μεγαλοψυχία. See the whole of the splendid definition of the *Mind of youth*. ARIST. *Rhetoric*, ii. 12 (pp. 89–93, edit. Bekker).

[2] St. John i. 19, 20, 29, 36; iii. 30.

[3] The synoptical delineation of the Baptist is, in one respect, analogous to its delineation of the Saviour. It is the loftier and more spiritual aspects of character which are chiefly in the view of the fourth evangelist. Hence the Baptist's Christological conceptions in the fourth Gospel appear to be more evangelical than we should gather from the synoptics alone.

of St. John are *idealized* pictures. But let us understand the word. We see the likeness of an ordinary face, endowed with a sort of vapid and unmeaning beauty; a coarse face, paddled and coloured by a cunning hand. People recognize the likeness and say, "it is such an one, only a little *idealized*." No! A face surprised with the glow of a virtuous feeling, or the visible inspiration of a triumphant thought; seen transfigured, interpreted in the light of an *idea*, of the idea of its life, this is an *idealized* picture. And such are the pictures in St. John.

We hear much of the "unhistorical character of St. John's school." But who are the really great masters of fiction? Not those who cover reams of paper with fine writing; but those who with the decided hand of genius strike off characters in a few bold lines,—those in whose pages the person and the words which he speaks are perfectly adapted. All competent readers feel that in Shakespeare there is no image, however exquisite, which would not lose by being detached from its context; no speech which would not suffer by being placed in other lips. If it be so, either the old man, with the senile style of which we hear so much, was a mighty dramatic genius; or, there is literal truth in the words—"that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you."

II

There are two more Leading Ideas in St. John's Gospel.

1. It was intended to show the growth of belief and unbelief round our Lord's Person. We see the tide gathering, until at last it goes over the head of the victim. Three miracles form three points round which it gathers—the healing of the Bethesda, the cure of the blind man, the resurrection of Lazarus.

Let us take another important instance.

We have seen that the special miracles recorded by the synoptics are omitted by St. John, with the exception of the feeding of the five thousand, and of the incident which immediately follows it. Why do the circles intersect here?

No doubt the importance of the discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, and the symbolical character of the miracle, are sufficient to account for this. Historically also these passages, taken in conjunction with the beginning of the seventh chapter, show us, that (while the synoptics mainly follow the Galilean Ministry, and St. John that in Jerusalem) the fourth evangelist was perfectly acquainted with the Galilean Ministry. For the Passover, mentioned in the sixth chapter, occurred in April; the Feast of Tabernacles in the

seventh chapter, in the end of September, or the beginning of October.[1] St. John then tells us that in the interval, "Jesus was *walking* in Galilee," which perfectly describes one main external feature of the Galilean Ministry.[2]

But, assuredly, one object which the evangelist had in view was to trace out the progress of belief and unbelief. And in the fifth and sixth chapters we have two forms of unbelief contrasted. The unbelief of Jerusalem—"the Jews sought to kill Him,"—the unbelief of Galilee—"this is an hard saying, who can hear it?" "Many of His disciples went back, and walked no more with Him."[3] Types of two forms of unbelief in all ages! One is sad or contemptuous, another fanatical. One sneers, another strikes. One sighs, another grinds its teeth. One would kill Him if it could; another turns upon its heel. One curses Him, and ridicules the sacred wounds; another only pierces His loving heart by leaving Him alone.

The very miracle is mentioned here, because it led to unbelief.

2. The fourth Gospel is throughout pervaded by the idea of human witness, of human testimony to

[1] St. John vii. 2; vii. 2, 14.

[2] περιπατεῖν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ or τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, St. John vii. 1.—"Ex Hebraismo, ut alia verba simili, *versor, commoror*. vii. 1 i. xi. 54. in quibus locis simul significat quod Joan. *ambulavit* dicitur." BRETSCHNEIDER, *Lex. Man.* s.v.

[3] St. John v. 18; vi. 60, 66.

Christ—from the Baptist; from the disciples; from the Jews at Jerusalem, during the first Passover; from the people which were with Him when He called Lazarus out of the grave; from the Pharisees who believed, but did not confess; from himself, who saw the blood and water coming from the pierced side; from Pilate and Caiaphas.

St. John delights to arrest and make permanent the burning cries of confession wrung from the hearts of men. From the Baptist, "behold the Lamb of God!" from Nathanael, "Rabbi! Thou art the Son of God;" from the Samaritan woman, "is not this the Christ?" from Peter, "we believe that Thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God;" from the people, "when Christ cometh will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done?" from the officers, "never man spake like this man;" from the blind man, "Lord, I believe;" from Martha, "I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God;" from Pilate, "I find no fault in Him;" from Thomas, "my Lord and my God." Wonderful music! drawn from the heart of man by the hand of faith, running up the scales from its faintest and lowest note—"Thou art the King of Israel,"—to its grandest and richest harmony, "my Lord and my God."[1]

And here it may be mentioned, how with a grave

[1] St. John i. 29, 36, 49; iv. 29; vi. 69; vii. 31, 46; ix. 38; xi. 27; xiii. 4; xx. 28.

and gracious irony St. John, again and again, takes up the supposed objections, which in reality were so many proofs. Thus—"then said the Jews among themselves, whither will He go, that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?" Easily answered by Gentiles, who were addressed by the Apostle from a Gentile city, in a Gentile language.[1] Again—"some said, shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh out of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?"[2] And so, when men allow themselves to exclaim triumphantly, "John knew nothing of the birth in Bethlehem"—we can only say that they know little of John.

(*a*) One Idea of this Gospel, then, is that it is a Gospel of witness, of human witness, to our Lord. Faith, in one aspect of it, is a plant which is intended to rise upward by twining round these proofs of evidence. We may see how much plausibility there is in the sneering assertion that the "Joannic school used, without scruple, the principle which was destined to become Hegelian, it *ought* to be so, *ergo*, it *is*;" and "that it is, more and more, an admitted principle of criticism, that if we would write *history*, we must mould our conception after the type in the synoptics, not after that in the fourth Gospel." We

[1] St. John vii. 35. [2] *Ibid.* ver. 42.

may point to such a passage as the opening of the fourth chapter—("when the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, He left Judæa and departed again into Galilee,")—with its matter-of-fact but valuable historical explanation. Here, again, St. John refers to and illustrates the synoptics. For the fact that John was cast into prison would not, by itself, have determined our Lord's departure from Judæa into Galilee, which indeed was part of the dominion of Herod Antipas. Every attentive reader may see for himself, that one Leading Idea of this Gospel is founded upon the great historical principle of the validity of *human testimony*—the great safeguard against scepticism and fanaticism. "If we receive the testimony of men" to the effect that "Jesus is the Son of God" —writes St. John in his Epistle, with evident reference to his Gospel.[1] The very form of the expression[2] shows that we do assuredly receive such witness, not only as Christians, but as rational men, according to principles which recommend themselves naturally to the unsophisticated human intellect.

(*b*) But again, as the witness of God is greater, so this Gospel is full of *Divine witness* to Jesus. Hence the mention of the attesting voice from heaven—"I have both glorified it and will glorify

[1] 1 St. John v. 9. [2] εἰ λαμβάνομεν.

it again." Hence the intense conviction that the Scriptures are "they which testify of Him;"[1] that "had they believed Moses, they would have believed Him." Hence the accumulated reference to type and prophecy in the narrative of the atoning death. To a mere human historian there might have seemed to be no more of deep purpose in the particular cruelties inflicted by the rude soldiery and the furious mob, than in the shape of the tangled knots of sea-weed flung by the spring-tide upon the beach. But every incident in the central event of the history of humanity is to his eye arranged "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God." The lots upon the poor vestment that wrapped the wasted form were cast by a Divine hand. The vessel with vinegar, the sponge and hyssop, were not there by chance. The perfection and dignity of that body, which seemed so helpless, were guaranteed by the rubric of the Divine ritual in regard to the paschal lamb—"not a bone of him shall be broken." The thrust of the soldier's lance is in the dark background of Zechariah's prophecy, and written upon the very body that shall come in the clouds of heaven. "They shall look on Him whom they pierced."[2] The evangelist's spirit sails over the deep of Scripture as over an Equatorial

[1] St. John xii. 28; v. 39-46.

[2] *Ibid.* xix. 24; Psalm xxii. 18; v. 36; Exodus xii. 46; Psalm xxxiv. 20; v. 37; Zechariah xii. 10.

Ocean; on the far horizon of prophecy he sees its Southern Cross.

(*c*) Christ's own miracles are yet another witness to the truth of whose Leading Ideas is witness. "I have greater witness than that of John; for the *works* which the Father hath given me, the same works that I do, bear witness of Me, that the Father hath sent Me."[1]

Miracles are called by four names in the New Testament. Of these three are thrown together in some passages.[2] Miracles are *potencies*, as manifestations of Divine power: things amazing (or *marvellous* in one passage),[3] as producing holy awe and amazement; *signs*, as moral evidences to all who are right disposed.

[1] St. John v. 36.

[2] Ἐφοβήθη γὰρ θαυμάσας, ὅτιβρα ἐπιτιθεῖς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἐπιτελεῖς (Acts iii. 22), συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασι καὶ ποικίλαις δυνάμεσι. (Hebrews ii. 4). Of the miracles of the holiness contrast of Christ: οὐ ἐστὶν ἡ κραυγὴ καὶ ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ κυριακοῦ σου παρουσίας καὶ τέρατι δυνάμει καὶ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι ψεύδους. (2 Thessalonians ii. 9.) "The combination σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα is found in the synoptics (St. Matthew xxiv. 24; St. Mark xiii. 22; St. John iv. 48); in St. Paul's Epistles (Romans xv. 19; 2 Corinthians xii. 12; 2 Thessalonians ii. 9), and most frequently in the Acts (eight times out of 1.-xv.). It is not found in the Catholic Epistles or the Apocr." (*Epistle to the Hebrews*, Bishop WESTCOTT, p. 40.) The δύναμις has an indication of *power* behind it; the σημεῖα is a singularity, which attracts an awe-struck *observation*, the Patriarch, *Epist. ad Rom.* Thess. iii. 250, on its connection with σημεῖα = *res observanda*); the σημεῖα is the appeal of the wonderful to the moral nature.

[3] θαυμάσια. St. Matthew xxi. 15.

The fourth synonym for miracles is *works*, frequently used by St. John.

St. Paul's use of *works* throws instructive light upon this. By works *alone* he never means *good works*. They are opposed to *faith*, as an inward principle of heavenly life to the sum total of the product of the weakened and enslaved powers of the natural man.[1] Works are those things which it is *natural for man* to do, being what he is.

Christ's works are to be interpreted on the same principle. They are, as the Baptist in St Matthew's Gospel heard of them,[2] such works as the Christ would do, such as were natural for Him to work. There are many speculative difficulties about miracles. We are used to reasoning from miracles up to Christ; may we not reason from Christ down to the miracles? Given a being like Christ—then the Christmas Eve, the star of the Epiphany, the glory of the Transfiguration, the riven rock, the rent veil, the opened grave, the Ascension to the heaven of heavens, are but the fitting framework of that divine picture. Voices from the silence which men deem eternal, and rays from the world which to them is darkness, may well haunt with their echoes, and lighten with their glory, the pathway of a life like that. The sick healed, the demoniacs dispossessed, the bread mul-

[1] Tholuck on Romans.

[2] τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. St. Matthew xi. 2.

tipled, the winds hushed, the waves on which He trod as securely as if they were Galilean meadows upon a summer's day, all these cease to be unnatural—"His Name is Wonderful." Therefore the supernatural is His natural element; supernatural works are natural for Him to do. For the believer, the Person of Christ witnesses to His miracles. For the unbeliever, the miracles may witness to His Person.

(*d*) There is a fourth testimony in the Gospel, one of whose Leading Ideas is testimony—the witness of Jesus to *Himself*—to His glory, to His sinlessness—"though I bear record of Myself, yet My record is true."[1]

Consider what this witness is. If any of us know a holy man, we know a humble man. The holiest men are the most conscious of their own sinfulness. It is not a fashion of speech. It is not cant or hypocrisy. The writer who is perfectly satisfied with his own lines is not a poet. The painters or sculptors who have no noble dissatisfaction with their work, may be ingenious and dexterous, but they are not artists. They have none of that straining forward to an unattained and unattainable ideal of beauty, which is the heritage of genius. So too the man who is perfectly content with his own spiritual condition may have a mechanical regularity of habit. He may be a

[1] St. John viii. 14.

respectable Pharisee. But he is utterly without that *saintliness* which is, as it were, the genius of goodness.

Now Jesus had the loftiest ideal of duty. He was also the meekest and humblest of men. Yet in His life there is one fundamental difference from the lives of the saints. They are full of burning words of penitence: they are burdened with cries of confession. But we have long discourses of Jesus. We have one soliloquy with His Father in the seventeenth chapter. Yet there is no confession of sin. He can bare His breast to His enemies, and say—"which of you convinceth Me of sin?"[1] He can go further; He can declare—"the Prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." Further yet—in those solemn moments when death is near; when moral natures, seemingly made of the strongest granite, crack and crumble before the fire of eternity; He can lift up His calm and trustful eyes to heaven, and say—"I have glorified Thee on the earth, I have finished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."[1] And with this we know that His spiritual insight was so keen and piercing that not one mote could have floated upon the tide of His purity without being detected by that eagle eye—that one speck or stain could not have rested on the very skirts of the garment of His humanity, without soiling in

[1] St. John xvii. 4.

His sight the raiment that was white as snow. This holy Man, with the highest idea of duty; this humble Man, who prays falling upon His face; this keen-sighted Man, who sees further into sin than any other, declares that His life and the perfect rule of goodness are in unbroken harmony. What witness is comparable to this witness of Jesus to Himself?[1]

On the whole, then, the Leading Ideas of St. John's Gospel are these. First, it is, in a special sense, the Gospel of the Incarnate Word. Then it is the Gospel in which the miracles and discourses of

[1] *Conquer, Victory*, is a Leading Idea of St. John's Gospel, in this sense, that the whole history of Jesus in that Gospel lends up to it. The word itself first occurs ἐμμένετε ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ τῇ κάλλιστα, xv. 9, with that first prelusive touch awakens a fuller sound in St. John's later writings. *Conquer* becomes a Leading Idea of the First Epistle (i. St. John ii. 13, 14; iv. 4; v. 4, 5). The Idea is still more dominant in the Apocalypse. [Each Epistle to each of the seven Churches closes with a promise which begins with τῷ νικοῦντι or ὁ νικῶν. Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21. For the victory of Christ or of His people, see iii. 21; v. 5; vi. 2; xi. 7; xii. 11; xiii. 7; xv. 2; xvii. 14; xxi. 7.] The Idea of victory is almost exclusively confined to St. John's writings. The exceptions are Rom. viii. 37; xii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 55, 57. The substantive νίκη is found only in 1 St. John v. 4; but the form νίκος is in Matt. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55, 57. The rendering *Conquer* seems preferable to *Victory*. It is not possible by any other translation to present to an English reader the fourfold repetition of the word (1 St. John v. 4, 5). "The *Victory* that hath *overcome* the world" (R.V.) falls in this, "The *Conquer* that has *conquered*" succeeds. The noble translation of ὑπερνικᾶν ("more than *conquerors*," Rom. viii. 37) is thus rendered consistent—happily retained by the revisers, though at variance with their principles.

Jesus, the sacraments of the Church, and the characters of those who are delineated, are spiritualized, and viewed from a certain high and ideal standpoint. Finally, it is the Gospel which exhibits the growth of belief and unbelief; it is the Gospel of witness—the witness of men, the witness of the Father, the witness of Scripture, the witness of miracles, the witness of Himself.[1]

[1] See Note B.

NOTE A

THIS may be a fitting place for observing a few of those minute touches in this Gospel, too minute and too delicate to have been deliberately invented; which, so far as they are not fancifully interpreted, do much to establish the *verisimilitude* of a narrative. They do not, indeed, by themselves make it *probable* (the *probable* is that for the reality of which we can allege some reason) but *illustrate*—"bearing the closest resemblance to that which is classed in our minds under the predicament of existence."[1]

Here are a few instances.

(a) "His disciples came, and marvelled that He talked with the woman: yet no man said, why talkest Thou with her?" "The disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom He spake. Now, there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter, therefore, beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom He spake."[2]

With as men, familiarity breeds contempt. No dignity will assert itself against a certain degree of intimacy. "No man is a hero to his valet." These passages, quite incidentally and informally, show that it was not so with the Word made Flesh. These simple men were with Him in familiarities, that would have disclosed anything that was not heavenly, and uncrowned anything that was not Divine. They trod the same road; they rocked in the same boat; they rested in the same chamber; they partook of the same course from; they

[1] Blanco White (quoted in Bishop Hampden's *Philosophical Evidence of Christianity*).

[2] St. John iv. 27; xiii. 22, 24.

drew out of the same sunny pane. Men exacts much of his silence; he asks little in reply, but performs them upon very slight provocation. One bitter word, one fretful or peevish sentence, one self-seeking action, one questionable look, would have dethroned Him. But "all our experience is reversed."[1] With us, familiarity breeds contempt. But as the disciples grew more and more familiar with Him, they find themselves more and more in presence of an awful dignity upon which they dare not intrude.

(8) "I go not up to the Feast"[2] (for also, not *alone*, is certainly the true reading). A charge of falsehood, or of fickleness, obviously lies against these words. But they are foolishly written down, though their meaning does not appear upon the surface.

One like the Christ could made Truth and truth was words in His own sense. Our great Christian moral philosopher has said that "a man may be under the strictest moral obligation to say what he foresaws will deceive, without his intending it." At all events, Jesus will weight these words with the meaning of His own soul. He is on the journey of which we read towards the close of the ninth chapter of St. Luke. To Him there is but one goal, up to Jerusalem, one Feast. "*My* going up is not to this Feast."[3]

(9) "I was wrapt."

Just before "He was troubled." Rather *troubled Himself*; for a certain divine decorum tempers all that we read of Him, and He is not represented to us as possessing a nature to be played upon by

[1] BUSHNELL. *Character of Christ.*

[2] ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν, ταύτην, ὅτι ἐμὸς καιρὸς οὔπω πεπλήρωται. St. John vii. 8.

[3] The gists of this explanation is found in an early date. "Ἔλεγον δὲ, οὐκ ἀναβαίνω, κ.τ.λ. τὸ γὰρ ἀμάθειν, μὴ γράφειν—φασὶν τὴν γὰρ ἀναμαρτησίαν διαλογιζόμενοι τοῦ κύριου ἀδύνατον εἶναι βλεπομένου τὴν ἔλεγον ἔστην γὰρ κύριοι μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τὸ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἀφαιροῦντες τὸ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἀφαιρεῖν τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν πάθος ἀλογιστικὸν τὸν πάθος κύριοι.—Hippolytus, (quoted by Tischendorf. *Nov. Test.* p. 814, Ed. 8). So Augustine. "Christus vero ille fuit dies fortius, quo contemnere sed noluerit mundum." S. August. *de Q. Nov. et Vet. Test.* Qu. 78.

[4] ἐτάραξε ἑαυτὸν. St. John xi. 34.

passive emotions. Why did He trouble Himself now? We cannot fully tell. Perhaps, we may conceive the case of a physician coming into a room, where friends and children are sobbing over one whom they supposed to be doomed, himself weeping in sympathy, though sure that he can heal. But at least, this shows us that we have a real Christ. It was never invented. The imaginary Christ would have walked majestically up the slope of the Mount of Olives, and, standing with a halo of the sunset round His brow, have bidden the dead man rise. The real Christ was a sharp and sorrowful man, who wept over the grave, and lifted up His eyes. The reality teaches us that the dead are not raised by a stoic philosopher, with an eye of fire and a heart of marble, but by One who is very Man, with the tender weakness that is more beautiful than all our strength. This, according to the judgment of centuries, is more majestic as well as more moving. But could a writer like St. John have *invented* it?

NOTE B

One most important inference as regards the character of our Lord's human knowledge should be drawn from the first great Leading Idea of the fourth Gospel.

"The Word was God, and the Word was made Flesh." He had not only a true Human body, but a "reasonable soul," a true Human intellect. In the one Person of Christ, there are two forms of wisdom, two manners of knowledge. The finite intelligence and the Infinite, the human and the Divine, differ as the created from the Uncreated, as the relative light of the Incarnate Word from the absolute light of the Uncreated Word. But they are at one, and work to one end.

Aquinas discusses the question whether our Lord had other than Divine knowledge. His answer is, that the affirmative is involved in the verity of His Incarnation. "Filius Dei naturam integram assumpsit, *i.e.* non solum corpus sed etiam animam, non solum accidentia, sed etiam rationalem. Nihil naturalium Christo defuit, quia totam Humanam Naturam assumpsit. Idcu in sexta Synodo

damnata est positio negantium in Christo esse *omnes scientias, sive* duas sapientias. . . . Minus hanc non officaciter per rationes, sed magis augetur, sicut humana scientia per humana solet. Et hoc modo humana scientia non officaciter sed clarescit in animo Christi per humanae scientiae infusae.[8] (S. T. AQUIN. Part III. Qu. ix. Art. 1.)

Therefore the Human mind of Jesus is never alone.[1] And the processes and the development of the Human reason rest upon the Infinite Wisdom.

If this be the true idea of Christ, what shall we say of His word? Must there not be perpetual power, perfect truth, in the words of the Word made flesh?

We may smile blandly with Schenkel or the simple man, who looked upon the very number of the four Gospels as divinely harmonizing with the quarters of the world, with the principal winds, with the four of the cherubim. We may be amused, if we will, at Augustine's quaint yet beautiful conceit, in expounding and applying to St. John the text in the psalm, "the mountains shall bring peace, and the little hills righteousness to the people."[2] The old man, with the shadows and the sunlights of the hills of Africa present to his mind, says—"the mountains are great souls, like that of John; the little hills are ordinary ones, like ours. Never should we have received the light of faith, unless those great mountain-tops, lighted up by the heavenly wisdom, had passed them on to us." Yet we read the words of Christ, and think who spoke them, we need not be ashamed to cry with Bernard—"I hear not Moses now. To me he is of consuming fire. Isaiah's lips are unclean. Jeremiah cannot speak; he is a child. All the prophets are mute. *Ipse, ipse, quem loquuntur, ipse loquatur.*"[3] S. Bernard. in Cant.

[8] St. John xvi. 31; v. 30; viii. 16-18; xiv. 10. See GRETZER. *Lex Sapientiae*, 135.

[1] S. Aug. *Enarrat. in Ps.* (Psalm lxxii. 3) see for more on the subject of our Lord's Human knowledge, *infra*, VI. D. Note A.

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION[1]

A.—ST. MATTHEW

"When Pilate was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man; for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of Him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus."—ST. MATTHEW xxvii. 19, 20.

ST. MATTHEW'S Leading Idea may be clearly traced in his record of the Passion.

He has in mind throughout the literal Jews, unworthy as they had become; the false and narrow

[1] The writer's obligations to Lange in this division of his treatise are considerable (especially *Life of Christ*, vol. iv. 108—116, 189—189, 390—398, 427—468. English Translation). To Archdeacon Farrar he also desires to express his acknowledgments. The Archdeacon's works seem to possess that kind of *originality* which alone is profitable in theology. Since the publication of his two principal books, no man can well treat upon either great subject as he would have done before. Consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly, he breathes their atmosphere and is influenced by their spirit, even when, like the present writer, he may dissent from some of their conclusions.

Judaism which they and their fathers had made; and Jesus confronted with them.[1] Here, above all, the first Gospel is the Gospel of types: of prophecy interweaving and multiplying its marvellous coincidences; of the true, over against the fallen and degraded, Judaism and High Priest.

The proceedings of the representatives of the people form their eternal condemnation. The Roman Governor has deep in his nature some reverent conceptions of the majesty possessed by law even in its anger. But how terribly the sentence sounds to men used to think of the spotless crime of our great magistrates! "The chief priests and elders, and all the council, kept seeking a false witness against Jesus to put Him to death."[2] The High Priest's affected and theatric horror is itself a violation of the law which he professed to prize so highly. For that law expressly forbade one who filled so august an office to sully the majesty of his position by an act which showed such hysterical intensity of an ill-regulated passion of grief.[3]

[1] St. Matthew xxvi. 57; xxvii. 9, 35, 46.

[2] St. Matthew xxvi. 9, 15, 46. ἐζήτουν. St. Matthew xxvi. 59.

[3] St. Matthew xxvi. 65. (Cf. Leviticus xxi. 10. ("And he that is the High Priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover his head, nor rend his clothes.") The very words of the LXX. are studiously preserved by St. Matthew. Cf. τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ διαῤῥήξει (Leviticus xxi. 10) with ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς διαῤῥήξας τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. (St. Matthew xxvi. 65.)

This is followed up by an outburst of vulgar hatred—the bitter sneer of fanaticism. "Others smote Him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote Thee?"[1]

Next, the judgment of Christ by the heathen, is decided by the baseness of the rulers, and by the violence of the mob, of His own people. "When they had bound Him they led Him away and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate, the Governor."[2]

The same great idea fills St. Matthew's soul throughout.

The treason and suicide of *Judas* (note the very *name*) is a concentration in a single life, so far as that is possible, of the treason and suicide of Judaism.[3]

How majestic is the bearing, how august the silence of the King of Israel before the representatives of Rome! "And He gave him no answer—no, not even so far as one word."[4]

In an awful pause there comes a message from Procula, the Proconsul's wife. Critics, who have studied Roman usages under the guidance of Tacitus, can no longer brand the incident as false. They are forced to content themselves with sneering at it as *trifling*—a woman's dream. We need

[1] St. Matthew xxvi. 67, 68.
[2] *Ibid.* xxvii. 1, 2.
[3] *Ibid.* xxvii. 3-11.
[4] καὶ ἀπεκριθη—πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα. Ver. 14

not ransack history for incidents where dreams have played some definite part. Perhaps some reader of these lines can recall a time when he was preparing to commit a great sin, and a warning has come from a woman's lips—"have thou nothing to do with it; I have suffered many things in a dream."[1] It will be observed that we have a glimpse of dreamland at the close as at the beginning of the Gospel. How far the dream was supernatural we cannot decide. The mind of the dreaming woman may have acted according to the subtle and occult laws which rule those rapid and evanescent phenomena. She had seen the Galilean, and the dignity and pathos of His bearing wove the strange scene from which she wakened scared and sobbing.

At all events, the fall of Judaism is brought out by this incident. In the long sad story of the Passion no Jew pleads for Jesus. That sweet office of softness and compassion is reserved for this Gentile lady. In St. Matthew's narrative, one little particle marks the contrast with a strange significance. "While he was sitting on the judgment-seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of Him. But the chief priests and the elders per-

[1] St. Matthew xxvii. 19.

suaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas, and destroy Jesus."[1]

After an ineffectual attempt by Pilate follows the hand-washing, as a symbolical expression of purity from a particular offence.[2] Critics say that the symbol was specifically Jewish, and that nothing similar is to be found in Roman trials. They may be quite right.[3] But Pilate may well have heard of this piece of ceremonialism. The plagiarism of a thing so impressive may have seemed to him a politic and dexterous stroke of flattery. No doubt in its result the ceremony was ineffectual for Pilate's purpose. But the imprecation has been fatally powerful—and all the people answered and said, His blood be on us, and on our children."[4]

The narrowness of Jewish fanaticism had soon spent itself. Its range of invention was limited—spitting, buffeting, blows, a taunt from the polemical sphere—and they had little fresh to say or do.

[1] Ἀνέπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους ἵνα αἰτήσωνται... τὸν Βαρραβᾶν καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν. (St. Matthew xvii. 19, 20.) In this M there is the wonder of a silent shame, the eloquent shudder of a suppressed horror. "So did the Roman woman; but the chief priests and elders (O the strangeness and the pity of it!) persuaded the multitudes that they should ask for Barabbas." The change of the R.V. ("now" for "that") is unhappy.

[2] St. Matthew xxvii. 24.

[3] "All the elders of that city, that are next unto the slain man, shall wash their hands over the heifer—and they shall say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it." See Deuteronomy xxi. 6–10.

[4] St. Matthew xxvii. 25.

But the mockery of the Romans was more serious and more inventive, more largely tinctured by a theatrical element. The Roman band[1] was a battalion of infantry from 400 to 600 strong. It has often been said in modern times that this mockery was unlikely to have taken place because it was so unworthy of the gravity of Roman legionaries.

Yet—not to speak of parallel instances gathered by the research of Bynaus—the temperament which would issue in such persistent buffoonery would seem to be part of the inheritance of the Roman nature. The modern Roman in the Corso at the carnival is the most gloomy and the most persevering of comedians;[2] a buffoon whose foolery is as pertinacious as it is childish. The legionaries gave themselves the treat of playing at a coronation. No considerable feature was wanting in that cruel

[1] συγκαλεῖται ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν. St. Mark xv. 16.

[2] This has been noticed by the friest and subtlest of observers with her usual delicacy of touch

"Il n'y a si base si bon goût dans la fête du carnaval; une sorte de pétulance universelle la fait ressembler aux bacchanales de l'imagination, mais de l'imagination ordonnée; car les Romains sont en général très sobres, et même assez sérieux, les derniers jours du carnaval excepté. . . . Il y a parmi les masques, des hommes qui se promènent le plus complaisamment du monde, dans le costume les plus ridicules, et qui, triste aréopage et taciturnes polichinelles, ne disent pas une parole—tout, pour ainsi dire, leur consistoire de carnaval satisfaite, quand ils n'ont rien négligé pour se diverrir."—MADAME DE STAEL. *Corinne, ou l'Italie.* Livre ix. c. i. (*La Fête Pipanini*).

childishness of men who were so strong. The mockery of Imperialism seems to be wild; but it was deliberate. Over the shoulders of the august sufferer they threw a camp pallium, once dyed with cochineal, now worn and faded; there was the robing. Round His forehead they placed a diadem of the dreadful acanthus thorn, and in His hand a reed; there was the crowning. They bent the knee; there was the homage. They cried "Hail, King of the Jews"; there was the acclamation. They gave Him to drink vinegar mingled with gall; there was the wassail cup outside the camp.[1] They played at a coronation—and they played it to the bitter end, sullen triflers drawing out their sombre comedy. And in stupid inexorable rage, as the reed dropped from His grasp, they kept beating Him with it upon His head.[2] Death and suffering were always somewhere in the old Roman amusements. There was something wanting in the laughter of those who had not looked upon blood.

In the section which follows the particulars (as beseems the first evangelist) are mainly connected with prophecy. We find the picture of the callousness of the human heart—the guards gambling, the

[1] ἔξω μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον (St. Matthew xxvii. 34), *i.e.* a potion flavoured with myrrh, mingled with gall or poppy-juice. This was prepared for sufferers upon the cross, often apparently by Roman women—the one touch of humanity in all the dreadful preparations.

[2] Βαλὼν τὸν κάλαμον καὶ ἔτυπτεν εἰς τὴν κεφαλήν αὐτοῦ. St. Matthew xxvii. 30.

cruelty beyond that of the cold experimentalist groping his way down the dim track of animal pain. St. Matthew records the title in that form which is most suitable to his Leading Idea.[1] He also records the fanatical Jewish mockery; the horrid echoes of distorted psalms below the cross; the blasphemy, not of ignorance but of Scriptural knowledge. Of the Elicy, so frivolously misunderstood—the one last word recorded by the two evangelists—we speak in the next Discussion. At last one pitying hand passed a cool sponge over the parched lips.

Such is the Leading Idea of Christ crucified in St. Matthew.

Jesus in His crucifixion is Messiah, the King of the Israel of God. As He moves through the prismatic sheet, His form is tinged with the hues of types. Psalms rise to some mystic chant, of which His sufferings are the subject. Prophetic bells keep tolling in the distance, and our hearts hear the name of Jesus between their strokes. He is the inheritor of all the sorrow and of all the glory which floats upon their music. The first Gospel gives us the Passion in the light of the Old Testament. We can best read the twenty-second Psalm and the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah with St. Matthew at the foot of the Cross.

[1] ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων. St. Matthew xxvii. 37.

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

B.—ST. MARK

"And when the centurion, which stood over against Him, saw that He so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God."—ST. MARK xv. 39.

IN St. Matthew we have the Passion of the true Messiah and Priest, confronted with the degradation of the apostate priesthood and people of Israel in the moment of its apparent victory.

In St. Mark, Jesus appears again as the Divine Hero. In brief, incisive, majestic lines, His death is recorded in its strength and majesty. "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," such is its opening cry. Deep answers unto deep. A voice from beneath the cross gives its unexpected response—"truly this man was the Son of God." "Jesus cried with a loud voice and

gave up the ghost."[1] A Roman centurion must probably have seen many deaths, but he never saw a death like that. In the last moment of life, the voice is weak and faint before it sobs or sinks into the long silence. Every other death is a defeat; this was a victory. Willingly, in the plenitude of power, Jesus dies. Often, when the smoke drifts away from before the lines, a cry of victory goes up. Never a cry like that. When the centurion saw that He so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, "truly this man was the Son of God."

I

The *vividness* which is characteristic of the style of the second evangelist brings out the *grandeur* of one aspect of the Passion with peculiar power.

Two specimens of human weakness afford a contrast which presents this grandeur in its ennobling strength.

One of these two is thus told:—"And a certain young man followed with Him, having a linen cloth cast about him, over his naked body; and they lay hold on him; but he left the linen cloth and fled naked."[2] We may well associate St. Mark himself with this strong impulse to advance but quick retreat in the moment of danger. Ever through the darkness which surrounds the Saviour's

[1] St. Mark i. 1; xv. 39. [2] *Ibid.* xiv. 50-52.

progress in the history of His Church He draws out a young, though sometimes not quite reflective enthusiasm. Yet spirits which have been finely touched to fine issues are never quite the same as if they had not received that touch.[1] Truly in St. Mark's flight was fulfilled the warning that "all ye shall be offended because of Me this night, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."[2]

The second picture presented by St. Mark to enhance the Saviour's greatness by way of contrast is that of St. Peter. The historian who makes us see his narrative by lightning-flashes gives us one of these gleams of sudden insight about the impulsive apostle. "And Peter had followed Him afar off, even within, into the court of the high-priest, and he was sitting with the officers warming himself towards the blaze of the fire."[3] We can see the red light on the bronzed features working with uncontrollable emotion.

"This incident is psychologically quite consistent with the Mark "who withdrew from Paul and Barnabas from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work." Acts xv. 37, 38.

[1] St. Mark xiv. 27.

[2] Φυγοπαίγνια πρὸς τὸ φῶς (St. Mark xiv. 54). How much homely wisdom there is in Bengel's pithy saying,—"sub corporis cura negligitur animus!" It should not be overlooked that in the Petrine Gospel much which concerns Peter's repentance is made emphatic clearer. The two-and-twenties are sharply and definitely put (1st and Peter went out into the porch, *and the cock crew*; and straightway *the second time the cock crew*." St. Mark xiv. 68, 72. Note also ἐπιστρέψας, ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιον. Ver. 72.

Beside these two irresolute forms; the young man flying in the hour of trial, Peter all flushed and flurried with his lie and sobbing in the bitterness of his shame; we contemplate on St. Mark's canvas of the Passion the calm unshaken serenity of the suffering Son of God.

Special touches are not wanting which bring out the majesty of sorrow.

St. Mark's picture of Jesus in the Praetorium is, perhaps, the most crowded and concentrated of the four. The elaborate mockery of a coronation; the robing, the crowning, the acclamation, the homage, the cup; is there in detail. The mantle for him is not merely dyed cochineal scarlet.[1] For him (as for St. John) it is an ideal lighted up with a significance—purple, "the purple."[2] The calm deliberate cruelty of measuring the head and platting for it the crown of the terrible acanthus with thorns nearly a finger long is told in words that cannot be mistaken—an affecting detail for imaginative devotion.[3] The mock homage is more expressively made visible by St. Mark's pencil. "They smote His head with a reed, and did spit upon Him; and *bowing their knees*[4] worshipped Him."

[1] χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέβαλον αὐτῷ. St. Matthew xxvii. 28.

[2] ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν πορφύραν. St. Mark xv. 17. ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν. Ver. 20. ἱμάτια πορφυρᾶ περιέβαλεν αὐτόν. St. John xix. 2.

[3] περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον. St. Mark xv. 17.

[4] κάλαμον καὶ γόνατα, ver. 19.

We may not pass from the narrative of the Passion in the two first evangelists without considering (1) the one of the last seven words from the Cross recorded by them, and (2) its coherence with their respective Leading Ideas.

1. The fourth word from the Cross is, no doubt, given by St. Mark in its most exact form.[1]

Let us assure ourselves that the sentence was, indeed, most certainly spoken.

Is it not a strange, nay, a tremendous fact that this is the only last sentence of the dying Lord preserved by the two evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Mark?[2] Let us conceive a missionary who has died a martyr's death. Some of his companions escape, and return to tell the glorious and pathetic story. Hundreds are anxious to know what the martyr said. Those who were present feel constrained to gratify this loving curiosity. Would there not be a feeling of dejection and of disappointment, if they told no more than this—"he said, my God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

Now, without denying that this saying is liable to be misunderstood (as the Agony has been misunderstood); a little reflection assures us that it also must be *historical* at least.

[1] Ἐλωΐ Ἐλωΐ λαμὰ σαβαχθανί. St. Mark xv. 34. Cf. Ἐλωΐ, ἐστιν. St. Mark v. 41. Ἐφφαθά, vii. 34. Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, xiv. 36.

[2] St. Matthew xxvii. 46. St. Mark xv. 33, 34.

"Legends falsify." No doubt. But they falsify on the side of splendid exaggeration. Their heroes look larger than human, as they walk clothed, with the mist of their glory. A god, a demigod, a hero writhing like a crushed worm, upon the earth, covered with a sweat of blood, feeling strange and out of place[1] in all God's world—no one ever invented *that*. It was a scandal in some measure to unwise and unfaithful Christian hearts in early times, who tried to erase the narrative in its fullest form from the third Gospel.[2]

Last words, it is urged, are sometimes deliberately invented; more often they are in the air, and grow spontaneously into shape. Our own day affords us an instance. The noble old officer, who gave Thackeray his idea of Colonel Newcome, is buried in a Scotch churchyard. A monument to his memory contains the beautiful sentence which tells how "Just as the last bell struck, a peculiar sweet smile shone over his face, and he lifted up his head a little and quickly said '*adsum*,' and fell back—and he whose heart was as that of a little child, had answered his name, and stood in the presence of the Master."[3] Local tradition will have it that the *adsum* was literally the last word of the officer

[1] Κάρον ἀπωσάμενος St. Mark xv. 33. St. Luke xxiii. 44, 45.

[2] See the long discussion in the note on St. Luke xxii. 43, 44. (*N. T. Gr.*, TISCHEND. Pp. 518, 519. Edit. vii.)

[3] THACKERAY, *The Newcomes*, Ch. xlii. ("In which the Colonel says *adsum*, when his name is called").

whose remains lie close to the spot. But a hero never presents himself to the popular imagination as crying—"my God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?"

The key to the difficulty lies in the answer which we give to the question—who and what is He who spoke the word from the Cross? The Catholic Christian answers, "I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, God from God, Light from Light, Very God from Very God, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate."

If He who died upon the Cross were other or less than this, what follows? This.

He had formed illusions from His earliest days, and obstinately clung to them. As the darkness deepened round Him on Calvary, and no smile was seen upon His Father's face, and no angel's wing beat the gloom with its whiteness; as the last golden drops of the young life ebbed away upon the dust of Golgotha; as He was left to go down to the pit with thieves, amidst the yells of the people whom He hoped to deliver; a profound discouragement, a horror of the great darkness of despair took possession of His whole being. We may pity Him; but after all it is only one other young soul for whom the noble visions of open-

ing life are belied by the cynical logic of circumstances.[2]

Thus the Christ who is not the Church's Christ is discrowned by His own hand, and undeified by His own lips.

But let us take our answer from our Creed, and what follows?

It was, indeed, for three hours a time of darkness outwardly and inwardly. "It was now about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour, the sun's light failing."[3] The darkness was not that of an eclipse,[1] it was the seismic obscurity which so often accompanies earthquakes.[4] The fierce pain; the torn brow; the thirst in the sultry and dust-choked darkness; the hatred of the people whom He loved; the indignity and shame, tortured that exquisitely susceptible mental and bodily organization. He remained silent three hours under the darkness; and death approached.

But why should He not meet it, calm and kingly, with a proud and superb self-control?

Because the answer of the Creed to the ques-

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, RENAN, 379-424. STRAUSS, *The Old Faith and the New*. Pp. 89, 90. (Blind's Translation.)

[2] St. Luke xxiii. 44, 45. R. V.

[3] The apocryphal Act. Pilat. (A. 16, 2) with characteristic exaggeration adds "ἔκλαιον ἥλιον γράφοντ κατὰ τὰ εἴκθτα." See Tischendorf, *N. T.* P. 533, n. Eds. vii.

[4] ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν. St. Matthew xxiii. 51.

tion, "Who and what was He who died upon the Cross?" involves for Him a death under two conditions.

(*a*) It was a death which bore the punishment of sin. So a prophet tells us. "The chastisement of our peace was upon Him."[1] So Apostles teach. "He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." "His own self bare our sins in His body to the tree."[2] Now the peculiar bitterness of the punishment of sin to any soul that has ever known the presence of God is its removing us from that presence—our alienation from God.[3] What must *that* have been to Him who could say, "I live by the Father"?[4]

This word from the Cross, then, is the compendium of the punishment of man's sin in man's representative.

(*b*) But, further. That death, in the view of primitive Christianity, is a "tasting death for every man,"[5] *i.e.* for each and all, His consciousness was in a sense fused with ours. The Prince of life felt death in His own Person

[1] Isaiah liii. 5.

[2] 2 Corinthians v. 21; 1 Peter ii. 24.

[3] So Moses, the "ocean of theology." "Ye shall bear your iniquities . . . and ye shall know *My alienation*, [ΠΝΙΝ], [ΠΝΙΝ], meaning, keeping back, standing off." Numbers xiv. 34. (R.V.).

[4] ἐγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα. St. John vi. 57.

[5] ὑπὲρ παντὸς. Hebrews ii. 9.

as the death of humanity. A great Lutheran thinker has ventured to say that "the heart of God felt death in the dying heart of men." Then death died in the heart of the God-Man, and the dereliction melted away in depths of light.

2. This last word coheres with the Leading Ideas of the two first evangelists very closely.

(*a*) For St. Matthew, Jesus, by using the first verse, claims the whole of the twenty-second Psalm for Himself. He makes the pathos and the exultation of it, the Passion and the power, alike His own.

(*b*) For St. Mark the very word of dereliction leads to the most glorious of proofs that the dying sufferer is indeed the strong Son of God. The world listens, and will murmur again and again "despair, impatience, ignorance." It is, indeed, a proof of His real suffering in His human soul—a sweet protest, if we will—but it leaps to His lips with a shout of triumph. The Gospel of the dying Lamb is also the Gospel whose symbol is the lion. At the ninth hour Jesus cried with a great voice,[1] "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani." The darkness is gone and over. The forsaking is a thing of the past.[2] Such a death is a proof even to the centurion that He who so dies is more than human.

[1] φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. St. Mark xv. 34.

[2] εἰς τὸ ἀγωνιάσαν με; Ver. 35.

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

C.—ST. LUKE

ST. LUKE'S narrative of the Passion is pervaded by the Leading Ideas to which we referred fully in the Discussion upon the third Gospel. The *beauty* of Jesus in His sorrow and suffering is present to the evangelist's heart and guides his pencil. To the *physician* we are indebted for the record of the physiological fact of the bloody sweat; to him who had learned so much about the hosts of heaven for the incident of the strengthening *angel*.[1] From the *psychological* evangelist we learn much of the curiosity of Herod and the indecision of Pilate with its fearful issue.[2] He, and he alone, records the look of pitiful and reproachful love,

[1] St. Luke xxii. 43, 44. [2] *Ibid.* xxiii. 8, 20, 25.

which half broke Peter's heart.[1] The chronicler of woman's heart in the presence of Jesus gives us the pathetic narrative of the women "wailing and lamenting Him," and the words, at once gentle and terrible, which He spoke with His face turned to them.[2] The revealer of the secrets of the unseen world records the sentence that tells us of the secret influence behind the general temptation of the Apostles, and of the special strength given to Peter after recovering from his fall.[3]

I

A consideration of the three last words from the Cross which are peculiar to the third evangelist, may probably afford the best development of this part of our subject.

In those three words we see the beauty of the dying Jesus in forgiving tenderness, in pardoning power, in perfect peace.

1. The beauty of forgiving tenderness.

[1] St. Luke xxii. 60-63. For another minute circumstance in a previous part of the third Gospel peculiar to St. Luke, *ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ* (viii. 8) with St. Mark iv. 9.

[2] *κατωμνύετο κλαίουσα.* St. Luke xxiii. 37-38.

[3] *ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου.* St. Luke xxii. 31, 32. It may here be added that thoughts bearing upon the psychology of the lost are given with peculiar force by St. Luke (xiii. 24-27). (Cf. however, St. Matthew xii. 43—xiii. 25; 31, 32, *ὑφέξουσι λόγον*, v. 36.) "O quam serena est miseria nostra, et mera, et diuturna."—Bacon.

They have finished all the dreadful preparatives. They have nailed Him to the Cross. They have stretched Him along the hard bed of agony. They are preparing to raise it with its sacred burden. His *first* word is of forgiveness for the crucifixion, for the executioners, for those who condemned Him. He pleads before the Father the sole extenuation of their guilt—"Father! forgive them, for they know not what they do."

2. The second of the last words is also peculiar to St. Luke.

The thieves were nationalist insurgents. At first, both joined in blaspheming Christ.[1] One is the harder villain,[2] probably has been "the evil genius" of the other. He only understands an armed Messiah, a Christ of earth. The other had seen part of the Passion. He had heard the first word. The awful earnestness of the prayer elevated his spirit, its tender forgiveness won his heart. The repentance, so rare upon a soft bed, ripened quickly in the sultry temperature of Calvary. He confesses his sin, and makes his act of faith.

Here is the highest illustration of one of St. Luke's great Leading Ideas. It is the Gospel of triumphant grace, of plenary forgiveness. The same pencil drew the penitent woman[3] and the

[1] St. Matthew xxvii. 44. [2] Lange.
[3] St. Luke vii. 44 *sqq.*

penitent thief. The first picture is soft and coloured. This is cut, and cut as if with the point of a diamond on a plate of crystal.

In this kingly word there is an assurance, a promise, and a revelation.

There is an assurance, "verily I say unto thee."[1] It is the peculiar style of Jesus. In intellectual society the so-called autocrats (who are really mere presidents of republics of small talk) say "I think." Profound students, much more random readers who grow dissipated among their books, exclaim "I read." The hard logician, as he works his way carefully from his premise to its conclusion, writes "I infer." Positive people repeat over and over "I say." But the form of Christ's speech is different, "Amen, I say." An act of faith in this is an act of faith in Him.

The promise is twofold.

One part of it is temporal, and gives the sufferer hope of a gracious abridgement of suffering. Men might and did live on even for days upon the cross. The constrained position, the rigid tension, the awful cramp, as well as the nails and the ever heightening fever, seemed to ensure a speedy death. Yet, strong as such desperate men often are, he might shake the cross with his throes of agony hour after hour. Here was a welcome hope of death ere the sunset faded from the sky—"to-day."[2]

[1] Ἀμὴν σοὶ λέγω. [2] σήμερον. St. Luke xxiii. 43.

But there was a better part of the promise. He is "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think."[1] The dying man only asks for recollection; that the Messiah-King in the moment of triumph should revert to one who had been His humble companion in death. "Jesus, remember me when Thou comest in Thy Kingdom."[2] The promise gives so much more than the penitent thought of. Not possibly, but "verily"; not in some remote future, but "to-day"; not vaguely, a unit among the surging millions, but close to Him, all the ignorance enlightened, all the hardness softened, all the sin pardoned—"with Me."[3] He says to this man as He had done to His own chosen—"where I am, there shall also My servant be."[4]

But that which peculiarly illustrates Leading Ideas of the third Gospel in this light is contained in the latter part of the promise, and in the general character of the whole incident.

For a third bright thread is woven into the texture of the promise. One of the Leading Ideas of St. Luke is to draw up at intervals, reverently and sparingly, but really,[5] the veil that hangs

[1] Ephesians iii. 20.

[2] Ἀπόστολε, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. St. Luke xxiii. 42.

[3] μετ' ἐμοῦ. Ver. 43.

[4] St. John xii. 26.

[5] St. Luke xii. 24; xiv. 9, 10, 31.

between this world and the next; to gratify or awe a pious curiosity by some distant glimpses of the conditions of the world unseen. This is one of St. Luke's revelations. It is the great *dictum probans* for the rest of the saints in Paradise.[1] The common loving speech which makes mention of the departed as in heaven is not false. But it is inaccurate. Paradise is the park, and the park is not quite the palace. There are two departments of bliss. The souls in rest have a hope as well as a memory. The Garden of Eden in the Old Testament is Paradise[2]—a word rich with thoughts of greenery, rest, and coolness. "In Eden are fairer trees than in Golgotha."

The whole tone and complexion of the incident and of the Saviour's word is in intense accordance with St. Luke's principal Leading Idea.

Ever since Christ pardoned the thief the Church has believed in pardoning grace. She sends to the inmates of the jail and to the outcasts of the streets, because she knows that the worst sinner may be but a saint spoiled. We perceive that the sea of grace flows so full and breaks so high that we can never single out a point where the tide can never wash and the wave can never reach—that we cannot

[1] *ἐν παραδείσῳ.* St. Luke xxiii. 43.

[2] פַּרְדֵּס, Genesis ii. 15; in παράδεισος or ἔδεν in LXX. Bonnet's summary of St. Luke xxiii. 43 is of matchless pregnancy: "*To day*—what speed!—*with Me*—what companionship!—*in Paradise*—what rest!"

pronounce of any human heart that it will never be softened, or of any human spirit that it will never rest in Paradise.

3. The seventh of the last words is also peculiar to St. Luke. If he delights in happy departing words[1] of the saints of God,[2] how much more would he exhibit to the Church the perfectly radiant and peaceful deposition of His spirit in the Father's hand by the King of saints! His beauty would not be quite perfect without that.

[1] St. Luke xxii. 46.

[2] So Simeon, St. Luke ii. 28–36, and Stephen, Acts vii. 59, 60. Is not this in accordance with the *Lucan* spirit, and of a piece with Hebrews xi. 13? It may be noted that the third Gospel has had a peculiar attraction for many minds. The Emperor Charles V. on his death-bed called for the narrative of the Passion according to St. Luke to be read. The delightful English naturalist, Richard Jeffries, was much occupied at the close of his life in reading St. Luke.—See Sir W. Besant's *Eulogy of R. Jeffries.*

VI

THE LEADING IDEAS OF THE EVANGELISTS IN THE NARRATIVE OF THE PASSION

D.—ST. JOHN

"They crucified the Lord of Glory."—1 CORINTHIANS ii. 8.

THE Leading Idea of St. John here is the Passion in its ideal glory; the crucifixion of the Lord of Glory. In this we may find the key to much which the fourth evangelist inserts or omits.

I

The divine glory of the sufferer's self-possession is the main subject of the first section of the history of the Passion in St. John.[1]

His fore-knowledge only brings this out more truly. The searchers are determined that He shall not hide or escape. "Judas having received the

[1] St. John xviii. 1-11.

band and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore, knowing all the things that were coming upon Him, went forth and saith unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered Him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am He . . . When therefore He saith unto them, I am He, they went backward and fell to the ground."[1] The imagination of a student of the psalms naturally recurs to one passage as prophetic or anticipative.[2] But the incident, if not miraculous, perhaps gains in moral grandeur. Late in the night, now even at the full moon darkening among the shadows and the trees, Judas falls back; and the crowd surges and sways, awed by the dignity, by the halo of sanctity round one unarmed man. Even in that hour the glorious and noble self-possession of the great and good Shepherd saves His flock. "Of those whom Thou hast given Me I lost not one."[3]

II

The Divine glory of the strange royalty possessed by the King of suffering is another Leading Idea of St. John's narrative.

"Jesus therefore came out wearing the crown of thorns and the purple garment. And Pilate saith

[1] St. John xviii. 3-7. [2] Psalm xxxv. 4.
[3] St. John xviii. 9.

unto them, Behold the man!"[1] This is one of the not very numerous passages, where we feel that the hand which holds the pen quivers with mingled emotion; that the admiration as well as pity of Pilate's exclamation almost overwhelms the evangelist. And the "Ecce Homo!" becomes the central inspiration of Christian art. We perceive the awe which has laid hold of the proud and cynical Proconsul. "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by that law He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God. When Pilate therefore heard that saying he was the more afraid."[2] The more afraid![3] Then an unwonted fear was upon him even before. But chiefly does His divine glory appear at the close of the section.[4] Before the great masters of jurisprudence he weighs out the degrees of guilt in scales that are divinely delicate and divinely just.

III

St. John's Leading Idea of the Divine glory in the Passion also appears in the three last

[1] St. John xix. 5.

[2] μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη. Ver. 8.

[3] The difficult v. 11 seems to be explained thus: Pilate's power of inflicting death was from above. The Roman magistrate had it committed to him by the divine right of fact. The High-Priest went out of his way to judge Jesus guilty of death, and then hand Him over to the secular power. Therefore he, and Judaism as represented by him, had incurred a greater guilt than that of Pilate.

[4] St. John xix. 7-9.

words, whose preservation the Church owes to him.

1. The first of these is the third in order of the seven—"Woman! behold thy son!—behold thy Mother!"

"All His acquaintance, and the women that followed with Him from Galilee, stood afar off seeing these things."[1] Now that there was a chance of approach, John and certain of the women drew near, and stood hard by the cross.[2]

Of the two first of the seven words, the first is priestly, the second royal.[3] The third, while it witnesses to His glory, is yet supremely human.

Let nothing rob us of that word.

"Possibly it was inserted owing to John's desire to gain importance and consideration." John hated lies, and branded them with a pen of burning point; yet he is ready to lie for a mean personal object, and that where his Master is deeply concerned!

"Perhaps the extreme loftiness of the character of Christ does not agree with such little personal tenderness at a crisis when He must have felt that He only lived for humanity."

From the literary affectation of the celebrated academician we may justly appeal to all who have

[1] St. Luke xxiii. 49.

[2] παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ, St. John xix. 25. In the gospel, St. (v. 25, μᾶλλον σταυρώσατε παλαιόν κέντρον ἐν καρδίᾳ τῷ σταυρῷ, κ.τ.λ.) there is a significant contrast between extreme cruelty and tender love.

[3] St. Luke xxiii. 34-43. [4] Renan.

known a mother and who still possess a heart. Who that reverences Jesus would be glad if He had forgotten or repulsed His mother? All the musical and golden pages of Plato's finest dialogue have not reconciled humanity to the passage where, after the fatal ship has arrived, we are told how when the wife of Socrates holds up his child, and pours out her passionate nature in sobs and cries, the philosopher coolly says—"let some one take her away," and proceeds with a disquisition upon the nature of pleasure and pain. Christians are thankful to read in the third word from the cross recorded by St. John the glory of that divine humanity. The heart of fire is also a heart of flesh.

The gift bestowed in those few syllables is divinely precious; for He who is so utterly poor[1] has yet gifts to bestow upon His own.

From a temporal point of view it is just the right gift. Mary had no other son; or the exquisite propriety of Jesus would never have delegated such a duty to another. He gives Mary to John and John to Mary. Meet temporal provision is thus

[1] The ἐμάνα and γυνὰ (vis. 23) seem to keep up the gradation in the ἐμάνα, ἐμαστιμάνη, of Psalm xxii. 18. LXX. (עָנִי), "usually the outer garment of an Oriental." (בֶּגֶד), the raiment generally. There may be an implied contrast between the sacred poverty of Him who was stripped of His very raiment, outer and inner (vv. 23, 24), and the rich gifts which He showers down from the Cross (v. 26).

made for the Mother of His love, and it is an affected spirituality which finds no significance and no lesson in this. There were also in His view affinities of heart and character, of thought and nature. And as the gift was the right one, so was it given just at the right moment. They had been standing hard by the cross; but from the very hour when this was spoken,[1] that disciple took her to his own home.[2] The sword, indeed, must pierce her soul, according to Simeon's word;[3] but He will not turn it in the wound. He gently spares her the long darkness and the Eli cry.

But Jesus also bestows a lasting and a larger gift, in which the evangelist would have the Church recognize the divine glory of the donor.

The bearing of this sacred legacy upon the theology of the Church is too much overlooked. The real glory of Mary is forgotten in a fantastic cultus. Our Lord is not a god masquerading in human flesh; He is not a man deified; He is God humanified. In Mary we have the *instrument* of that awful dispensation. The *fact* was enshrined and graven in her very flesh. In John was found the theologian, for whom the *idea* was corrected and enlightened by long communion with the in-

[1] ἐλεύθεροσε. V. 25. ἀφ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας. V. 27.

[2] The word *home* is not literally in the text: Ἔλαβον αὐτὴν εἰς τὰ ἴδια. V. 27.

[3] St. Luke ii. 35.

strument through whom the fact was brought into the domain of history.

The Leading Idea which underlies the special record of the third of the last words is the glory of the perfectly affectionate Divine humanity, and of the provision made for the central mystery of the faith by the communion established between the *instrument* and the *theologian* of the Incarnation.

2. The fifth word from the cross, the second of those preserved by St. John, gives further proof of the Divine glory of the perfect humanity.

Those who have seen much of pain and sickness know too well how much the patient is self-absorbed, how peevish and irritable the bravest and most gentle often become. The Roman in the great dramatist's representation remembers how Cæsar in his fever cried for drink like a sick girl. Sir Walter Scott describes the once chivalrous and stately gentleman swearing reproaches at the tender woman who nursed him because he broke the cup which was carefully handed to him.[1]

The Jew who pitily pain has one only of His last words—the fifth, "I thirst."[2] This is connected at various points with the Leading Ideas of St. John.

(*a*) The reality of His bodily pain is a great

[1] The delineation was believed by many who knew the great novelist to have been drawn from his father.

[2] Ἐιμί. St. John xix. 28, 29.

anti-Doketic fact. It necessarily implies the reality of His bodily and nervous organization. After His agony; after being dragged from tribunal to tribunal; after the mockery by the Jews before Herod, and by the Roman soldiers; after the crown of thorns; after the laceration of the tremendous Roman scourge, whip-cord stiffened with bone or metal; after the cramp upon the cross; after the big drops rolling down the face, and falling from hands and feet; after the parting with human love and the dereliction through the long hours of darkness; the raging death-thirst set in. Christ does not dwell upon His sufferings. From those white lips there drops only one word about them, but that is enough.[1]

[1] Modern feeling always seems ready to commiserate ancient. Ancient Christianity always held that no physical suffering was like His. Modern refinement minimizes the physical suffering of the dying Lord. A justly celebrated preacher has essayed to prove that the chieves suffered greatly more. But the place of any creature in the hierarchy of life is exactly proportional to his place in his hierarchy of suffering. The lower mental and moral organization suffers less than the higher and more refined. The dying Chinese murderer, slowly starved to death, grins and snarls through the bars of his iron cage at those who surround it. St. Paul's word καθαρὰ is very significant. Christ's is such a *pathetic* time. (Acts xxvi. 23.) It is difficult to suppose that *κλῶν ἐν καταφύτῳ μου*, as quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 5, Pa. xl. 6), has no reference to the sacrificial sacrificial organization of the Son of Man. Bishop Westcott's explanation of "the Body" as the totality of the Redeemer's own personal endowments—of the "preparation (κατηρτίσω) of the outfitting for varied and harmonious service" (Epistle to the Hebrews, 399, 310)—would rather include this conception.

(δ) This word also intimates the attainment of a divine point in the history of the Passion.

"After this Jesus, knowing that all things are now finished."[1] The victory begins to brighten in His heart. There is perfect unity in His character as delineated by the different evangelists. As in St. Luke's account of the Temptation, there is first the spiritual struggle, then recognition of the bodily need.[2] Like some hero, absorbed in his glorious labours, he feels no exhaustion until the storm of battle has rolled by; then first He calls for drink.[3]

It should not pass unnoticed that in this place we have another indication of a Leading Idea of St. John. He intends us to see that He is of the Privy Council, and in the secrets of the King—that He is admitted to His confidence, and knows the thought which lies behind His deed or word.[4]

Certainly, too, the sacredness of the Old Testament is a Leading Idea with St. John as with St. Matthew, if not so markedly and obtrusively. No doubt his "that" is not of conscious, rigid, fatal predetermination.[5] The little guard or detachment of four turned out that morning with the usual

[1] v. 28.

[2] "He did not nothing in those days; and when *they were completed, He hungered.*" St. Luke iv. 2.

[3] This illustration, like much else in this part of our work, is due to Lange.

[4] *Cf.* οὐδὲν ὁ δοῦλος ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου (xiv. 28) with ix. 21, 23, 25; vi. 6; xi. 13; xiii. 1, 3, 29, 36.

[5] ἵνα, "ecbatic," not "telic," v. 28; *cf.* v. 24.

precision of the splendid Roman military machine. The sponge was not forgotten for cleansing any part of the accoutrements which might be stained with blood; nor the hyssop-stalk for convenience in using it; nor the vessel containing the allowance of "posca"—agreeable in a hot climate. Had one of the soldiers been told that each of these particulars was divinely ordered, he would have laughed in derision. Yet *thirst* was part of the image of the Sufferer in the prophetic mirror.[1]

(*c*) But, further, in this word there is a revelation of the glory of His character.

How truly human He is! He complies with the claim of the body. To seek refreshment becomes a duty.[2] The Stoic, sheathed in marble, might affect to be above a bodily want. The Indian, ringed round by fire at the stake, has often disdained to ask for a drop of water to touch his blackened lips. The Fakir hangs without a word upon his hook. The difference between him and the dying Lamb is the difference between free self-sacrifice and a form of crazy suicide.[3]

In Him there is no affected superiority to suffering. He is truly human.

[1] Psalm xxii. 15; Isiv. 21.

[2] There were three "draughts" on the cross. (*a*) The proffered opiate. St. Matthew xxvii. 34. (*b*) The seasoll cup of the mock coronation. St. Luke xxiii. 36. (*c*) The liquid upon the sponge. St. John xix. 29.

[3] This is another of Lange's illustrations.

His glory is further shown by the fact that this word contains an appeal based upon His belief in the humanity of man.

There are two elements in man which point to the past and to the future. The one is a *fact* founded upon a portion of his history; the other is a *possibility* which starts from a supernatural gift. Into the lower of these elements Christ had a terrible insight.[1] For the other—that ear which was so sensitive to the discords of sin, was the first that ever heard the vibrations of the one note that yet kept tune and time in the harlot's passionate heart. He read, as no moralist or physiologist has ever done, the law which goads on the habitual sinner, the waxing of the impulse with the waning of the pleasure. Yet He had a deeper belief than any other in the possibility of recovery, in the existence of an almost undying germ of good. With this double belief He has inspired His Church. She believes in the Fall; that man is "very far gone" from original righteousness.[2] Yet she speaks the language of a lofty aspiration to the lowest and most fallen. As she reads history, she brings a belief in virtue to the task. We have but to contrast the historians of the Church with the master of epigram, who has written of

[1] See St. Mark vii. 22; St. John ii. 24, 25.

[2] "Quos fingulariter" (Art. ix.), *i.e.* as far as is possible for a being like man, without being degraded into a brute or sublimed into a deed.

her origin and first progress in the Roman Empire. For Gibbon, if the servant of Christ has renounced the world, it is because he has found out that he will not succeed in it. For him the virgin is not very pure, nor the saint very holy, nor the martyr very wise.

The Church's Master came to make men more human, to endow them with a truer humanity. He appealed to them as men, and gave them credit for some portion of that which He enabled them to develop and enlarge. In this word He seems to say—"I cannot use these hands, cannot raise a cup to My lips, if a cup were here. I know that there is human feeling among you. I thirst."

Some effect was produced. "Some of them that stood by" had said before, "behold, He calleth Elijah. And one ran and filled a sponge full of vinegar, put it on a reed, and gave Him to drink, saying, Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take Him down."[1] If there was something of superficial mockery, compassion was not altogether wanting. The pathos of that death awakened pity, and pity is contagious. But a little after it broke out with irrepressible emotion. "All the multitudes that came together to this sight, when they beheld the things that were done, returned smiting their breasts."[2] "Jesus saith, I thirst. There was set there a vessel full of vinegar; so they put

[1] St. Mark xv. 35, 36. [2] St. Luke xxiii. 48.

a sponge full of the vinegar upon the hyssop, and brought it to His mouth.[1] St. John explains and fills up St. Mark's narrative.

But there was more than pity abroad. The darkness awed the multitude. An impression was made upon many by the patience, delicacy, courage, dignity, sweetness of the Sufferer. In the Eli cry there were those who had heard for the first time the reality of prayer. Something of Elijah's character and history was known to the legionaries distorted and exaggerated by tradition. They were not without fear of some manifestation of the prophet of retribution who came on errands of vengeance, and through the rush of rain and the sheet of fire passed like a cloud to the hills. "Let be; let us see whether Elijah cometh to take Him down." It is frivolous; they jest. But it is tremendous; they tremble. One feels it in their words.[2]

It would seem from St. John that more than the one mentioned by St. Mark,[3] who actually passed the cooling sponge over the dying lips, were the first-fruits of that appeal. So that even its first result was a finer feeling, a reader sympathy, a more instinctive tenderness.

3. The third of the sentences from the cross

[1] St. John xix. 28, 29. [2] ἄφετε—ἴδωμεν. St. Mark xv. 36.
[3] οἱ δὲ παρεστηκότες ἔκδυσαν κ.τ.λ. St. John xix. 29. ἔρημοι δὲ εἰσὶ κ.τ.λ. St. Mark xv. 36.

peculiar to St. John is the sixth in order—"it is finished."

This word was already in His heart before it was spoken.[1] The most comprehensive and generalized of these sayings is thus linked to the most special and personal. Let us consider the Divine glory of this.

(*a*) First, and most obviously, life on earth was finished. "All things are at an end for me"—a Greek dramatist places the words in the lips of a dying man.[2] And equivalent language is uttered every day. The most commonplace spectators around the cross, if asked by their rough comrades what the dying man had just uttered, would have answered—"he says that all is over." The Christian remembers that it was the one white life among the blurred records of human existence—the only one of which He who lived it could say with truth, "I glorified Thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which Thou gavest Me to do."[3]

(*b*) To believers it will be equally obvious to supply "all things written in Scripture." The evangelist—here, as often, the interpreter of the inner mind of the Lord—looks at once into the heart of Scripture and the heart of Jesus.

[1] εἰδὼς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται (v. 28), with τετέλεσται (v. 30). The alteration of "accomplished" (v. 28 A.V.) for "finished" (*ibid.* R.V.) is, therefore, very important.

[2] τέλος ἔχει τὰ πάντα μοι. St. John xvii. 4.

For, throughout that life, all things were done which the law required;[1] all things were fulfilled which prophecy foretold. Stroke by stroke the picture grew, the crucifix was carved. Often there was merely a hint; then some seer "learned in sorrow what He gave in song." The fulfilment was shaped out, not on canvas, nor in words and stone; but by the living God in human flesh.[2] The abrogation too was finished of all that had been tolerated until the coming in of the better dispensation, when imperfections and littlenesses were to be ennobled, rites superseded by the Eucharist, and washings by regeneration.[3] All that was typical also was finished by being realized—the four forms of sacrifice by the fourfold fulness of the one offering. All His sufferings too were finished—the sorrow of that loneliness, the shame and pain, the burden of our sins. The promises, too, dim in their magnificence, so often seen by the saints trembling through their tears, were finished. All the promises culminated in this, "he that conquereth shall inherit these things;" but these things are the "all things" just above.[4] As for him who walks in some lovely scenery, the mountain and the river, the sunshine and the

[1] Leviticus xxii. 21; St. Matthew iii. 15.

[2] St. Luke xxii. 13; xxii. 37. Acts xiii. 29.

[3] Colossians ii. 14.

[4] ὁ νικῶν κληρονομήσει ταῦτα. Apoc. xxi. 7. *Cf.* κτῶνται ταῦτα. *Ibid.* v. 5.

shadow, are things of which he can say—"all this is mine."[1]

Such is the Divine glory of Christ as revealed to faith in this word from the cross.

Finally—one incident of the cross, mentioned by all the evangelists, is given by St. John as a conspicuous instance of one of his Leading Ideas. Human language is considered as a witness to the glory of the universal King.

The world-wide importance of this witness is indicated.

An oblong tablet is placed over the cross with the accusation written upon it.[2] Pilate dimly felt the significance of this. His answer to the chief priest is partly a bitter sneer; but there is in it also an inner feeling of the true royalty of the crucified Nazarene, and a profound conviction that he and they are at that moment "making history." St. John was nearer the cross than the others. It is a fact of our nature that in times of the deepest mental suffering, outward circumstances, apparently of no great importance, are burnt into the memory. We have, therefore, probably in St. John the most accurate version of the words of the Title, and the true order of the language—Hebrew, Latin, Greek.[3]

[1] 1 Corinthians i. 19, 20.

[2] St. John xix. 19. "Pilati jussu hoc natum." (BENGEL.)

[3] "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." St. John xix. 19. ("ἰρῆνικον verba," BENGEL.)—Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί.

Of the three languages, the first was national, the second official, the last the "common" dialect of many races. But there was more than this. There is a general character in language. The first is one of the simplest and most vivid of languages, nearly every verb being a picture. The second is strong and sententious, the language of law and moral satire, yet capable of lyrical sweetness as well as adapted to the

> "Whether of the earthliest measures
> Ever moulded by the lips of man."

The third has been splendidly characterized as "a musical and golden language, which gives a soul to the objects of sense and a body to the abstractions of philosophy."[1] These languages also have a history. Hebrew is the speech of revelation. Latin has had two histories—the first in the Roman people with their conquest and their jurisprudence; the second in the massive theology, in the sweet and awful hymns of the Latin Church. Greek represents the principle of progress; it is the pollen which has vitalized every flower of thought that lives upon earth.

Thus the three languages represent not only three races, but their qualities and tendencies. Wherever these exist—wherever there is an eye to read, a hand to write, a tongue to speak—the cross

[1] Gibbon.

has a message, and the King a kingdom. The "Title"[1] is, in St. John's view, the witness of language to the King of the Jews, who is also the King of humanity.

Thus, by the Divine self-possession so strongly contrasted with human weakness; by the hushed awe of the Roman Proconsul in the presence of a prisoner, as these few deep words come, grand and brief, as if from the long silence of God; by the strange royalty of the pathetic form, tricked out in that sad finery, and crowned with that dreadful coronation; by those unlocked-for fulfilments of type and prophecy; by the glory of those three last words, which any one, apparently, might have spoken, and yet in which he folded all suffering, power, and love; by the heaven and earth keeping guard round the helpless body of the Lamb of God, we behold a glory as of the Only-Begotten. They "crucified the Lord of Glory."

IV

On the whole, in the part of this discussion which bears upon the Leading Ideas of the evangelists in the narrative of the Crucifixion, we have seen the Passion in its sacredness, in its power, in its tenderness, in its glory—the dying Saviour as true, mighty, beautiful, divine—the

[1] τίτλος.

last words and the death of the Messiah, of the Son of God, of the Son of Man, of the Word made Flesh.

This fourfold delineation meets the wants of the Church and of humanity.

1. St. Matthew addresses that Hebrew element which will never quite pass away.

The history of the Bible supplies the moral and spiritual corrective to the dazzling pictures of our human history. Its heroes are the selfish and the strong; its favourite tales are of conquest.

The subject of the first Gospel is the Hero of all time, the Heir of all the ages, of the tragic anguish of the prophecies. Its motto is—"that it might be fulfilled."

2. St. Mark rather responds to a certain Roman element in our race. The Lamb is also the Lion. The cross lifts up a victor. He who was crucified through weakness lives by the power of God. His apparent feebleness was at all times sustained by a reserve of wondrous strength. Of that strength He makes His Church a constant partaker. Work and confirmation is its summary.[1]

3 Of St. Luke's connection with the Hellenic temperament we have already spoken at large.

4. St. John answers to the claims of religious

[1] τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος. St. Mark xvi. 19, 20.

reflection, to the wants of those who *think* as well as *pray*. The Church must be vertebrate; she needs an organization and a theology. In St. John she finds the great dogmas of the Gospel, the theology of the Incarnation and of the Cross.

VII

QUALIFICATIONS OF AND CONCLUSIONS FROM THE CONCEPTION OF LEADING IDEAS IN THE GOSPELS

I

WHAT has been said of the Leading Ideas of the evangelists requires to be carefully guarded by one qualification.

If, then, the Leading Idea of one evangelist found no kind of support in any or in all of the other three, his Gospel would incur the gravest suspicion of being ideological, an imaginative essay lying outside the region of fact.

But there is none of the evangelists who has not passages which set forth the Leading Ideas of one or more of the other evangelists as clearly as the Gospel itself in which the Idea is most frequent and obtrusive.

The following instances are in point. (*a*) St.

Luke's is throughout the Gospel of the call of the Gentiles. Yet the narrative of the star-led Wise Men, the glorious symbol of that call, is peculiar to St. Matthew. The mysterious attraction which drew certain men of the Hellenic race to Jesus just before His crucifixion is recorded by St. John alone.[1] (*b*) The record of the *scientific* side of miraculous cures, or of incidents connected with the Saviour's physical organization, finds illustrations in St. Mark and St. John, as well as in St. Luke.[2] (*c*) The highest theological conceptions and expressions of the self-consciousness of the God-Man are not exclusively confined to St. John.[3] (*d*) Subtle psychological traits in St. John, whether of our Lord Himself, or of persons mentioned in the Gospel, scarcely yield in interest and importance to those which have caused St. Luke to be termed by modern believing critics "the psychological evangelist."[4] (*e*) The peculiar blessings of

[1] St. Matthew ii. 1–12 (cf. viii. 11, 12); St. John xii. 20–37.

[2] St. Mark viii. 23, 24; St. John xix. 34.

[3] St. Matthew xi. 25–30 (specially v. 27), εἰς τοῦτο ἐξῆλθον. St. Mark i. 38; St. John viii. 48; xi. Luke x. 21–23.

[4] Thus the totally different expression given to a blind man's face by the restoration of sight is given with matchless delicacy in St. John ix. 9. Our Lord's sympathetic to more positive emotion, even when He submits to it, is conveyed by St. John xi. 33 (ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι). Cf. xii. 27, 28. St. Mark iii. 5 (συμπαραλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας) proves that the second evangelist has some of St. Luke's gifted insight into the mind of Christ. St. Matthew's mode of telling the Baptist's "sending by his disciples" from prison to Jesus, shows that he thoroughly perceived the psychological

poverty cannot be turned with truth "peculiar to the Ebionite Gospel, the heresy of Luke." They are found in the other three evangelists.[1] (*f*) The fulfilment of Hebrew prophecy is only less close to St. John's heart than to St. Matthew's.[2]

Thus, whatever is *diffused* as a Leading Idea over one Gospel is found *concentrated* as an existing and important Idea in all the other Gospels, or at least in some of them.

paradox of the varying effect of evidence according to subjective conditions, profoundly put by a great poet.

> "The mind's repose
> On evidence is not to be ensured
> By act of naked reason. Moral truth
> Is no mechanic structure built by rule,
> And which, once built, retains a steadfast shape
> And undistributed proportions; but a thing
> Subject, you deem, to vital accidents,
> And, like the waters-lily, lives and thrives
> Whose root is fixed in stable earth, whose head
> Floats on the tossing waves."
>
> WORDSWORTH. *Excursion.* Works, p. 444.

[1] St. Augustine has stated this question with the large good sense that he often exhibits. "Sic suscepit inopem divitem crucifixus egens, ut tamen plus pauperum suscepit sinus divitis (St. Luke xvi. 19-21)." "Iesa superba (1 Tim. vi. 17-19) divitem illum qui contemnebat pauperem Iazim ex iis quos in incerto divitiarum, quo se propter purpuram, byssum et epulas splendidas beatum putabat; non ipse divitiae perdiderunt ut inferni tormenta."—*S. Aug. Epist.* civ. 23-26, opp. tom. ii. 686. Edit. Migne.

[2] St. John ii. 17 vii. 38; xii. 38-41; xv. 25; xviii. 9; xix. 24-28, 36, 37.

II

We may take one incident common to all the evangelists as a specimen of the way in which the narratives were moulded by their Leading Ideas—the call of Simon and Andrew, James and John—(1) St. Matthew records it very briefly, apparently mainly as the fulfilment of a prophecy of Isaiah.[1] (2) St. Mark's notice is also short. To him the conversions present themselves as noble instances of the attraction of grace, of the resistless magic of that voice.[2] Nothing is impossible with God. Yet that two brothers should simultaneously obey a call which involved so much self-sacrifice is no ordinary event. But that another pair of brothers should do so, and leap at the same moment over a mental and moral chasm so vast, constitutes a complex improbability which the ingenuity of a mathematician has set itself to state in the terms of his science.[3] The modern critical and historical spirit is tempted to see *prima facie* indications of the *iteration* so commonly characteristic of the legends

[1] St. Matthew iv. 18-23; St. Mark i. 16-21; St. Luke v. 1-12; cf. St. John i. 35-43. We speak for convenience of the incident as common to all the evangelists; though, of course, St. John's account is, strictly speaking, not *the call itself*, but the *preparation* for it in the case of Andrew and Simon.

[2] St. Matthew iv. 14-22.

[3] St. Mark i. 16-20.

[4] See the ingenious statement of Mr. Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, pp. 196-202.

of the most different countries.[1] But St. Luke, with his keen moral tact, bridges over the chasm by supplying the psychological antecedents of the cases, which, stated barely, might seem strange and even suspicious. There was a previous connection between the pairs of brothers and the Master, as there were business ties between Simon and Andrew, John and James. All four had previously heard some of that great teaching and been brought near to that marvellous personality. They had seen a miracle just of the character to impress minds like theirs. Simon Peter felt the spiritual awe of a decisive beginning, of a resolve which had been slowly maturing, and which was now brought to full ripeness by the fierce light of the spiritual world thrown upon it in a few moments.[2] St. John (one of whose Leading Ideas is the instructive historical actuality which balances his unquestionable idealism) clears the way still further. One of the pair of fisher-brothers—intimate and in practical relations with the other—were disciples of long standing. Jesus had long before looked into the

[1] "James and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon" (St. Luke v. 10).

[2] "But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken: and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men" (St. Luke v. 8–11).

very depths of Simon's being with that penetrating and attractive glance.[1] The call, which had been long prepared for, being more than half expected, came at last. All the narratives are true. No one is in any way inconsistent with the others. But the first two evangelists reducted their gospels when much was fresh in the memory of the Church, which was taken for granted and did not need to be written. St. Luke fills in the particulars, and St. John supplies a solid substratum in the earlier part of the evangelical story. They all are true. For St. Matthew the obedience of the brethren to a call of such momentous import was, indeed, one individual and most beautiful illustration of the prophetic announcement of the "great light" which was to "spring up" from Galilee of the Gentiles. To St. Mark the incident was another proof of the magnetic and triumphant sweetness, the *victrix delectatio* which the Conqueror of hearts communicated instantaneously[2] to the wills of men. St. Luke, the psychological evangelist, indicates that in this, as in all other circumstances, no inch of human nature lies outside the reign of law; that the spark of heavenly grace in this case also sets fire to materials previously provided. St. John, with no immediate view to this incident—from his *historical* tendency and purpose—has laid a strong

[1] Ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, κ.τ.λ. (St. John i. 43).

[2] Εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθουν. (St. Mark i. 18.)

foundation of fact under the statements of his predecessors. To us this seems an interesting example of the benefit which arises from a judicious use of the conception of Leading Ideas.

III

With three inferences we may conclude.

A

The first regards the view of the verbal structure of the Gospel which we are forced by truth to take.

1. The "informal character" of these memoirs is brought out by the very nature of the Leading Ideas by which they are pervaded. Our Lord's words are not given, either in their original language (except a few broken words chiefly in St. Mark), nor apparently in a version of them *literally* and absolutely accurate. The spirit of them is preserved in the highest degree. But we have different versions of the same words with a view to the evangelists' chief purpose. Events are not generally narrated in exact chronological sequence. We cannot help feeling that in some one narrative, one evangelist has more profoundly grasped and more thoroughly co-ordinated the circumstances than the others.[1] Thus, we have not

[1] This, as we have seen, is notably the case with the whole incident of the rich young man, and the words following from R. St. Mark x. 17–38.

one perfect and unbroken record of the earthly life of the Saviour, but four different photographs, "four different projections," which each soul has to reproduce for itself.[1]

Are there no minute inaccuracies? Are we forced by preconceived theories to suppose, for instance, that the truth of the Gospel depends upon cramming each of the words in the four titles over the cross, given by the four evangelists, into *one* connected form, from which no syllable is wanting?

Two principles appear to be certain:

1. The revelation in Holy Scripture is necessarily contained in words and sentences. "The law speaks with the tongue of the children of men." The medium which it employs and the persons whom it addresses are alike imperfect. It must lower what is divine in elevating what is human. It is the *approximation* of divine thought to human intellect and feeling. It is not, it cannot be, *exclusively* divine.[2]

2. But if not *exclusively* divine, it is so *sufficiently* for the ends which it contemplates.

As regards the Gospels with which we are now concerned, Jesus founded a Society. The peculiarity of the members of that Society is that they are spiritually like Him; that His words and works

[1] This fact, and its moral and spiritual gains, are admirably stated by Mr. Luthens. *Doctor Pastorum* (pp. 16-18).

[2] See Note at end.

are the rule and model, the very breath of their existence. The life of each true Christian is a small replica, the Church a great one, of His.

But if (as experience proves) Jesus is not visible and audible; if the Spirit uses Christ's words and deeds as the necessary condition of His action, the Church must have a substantially true and faithful image of His human life, teaching, and conduct. Either the Gospels are in their language and structure inspired and divine *sufficiently* up to this point and for this purpose; or, if not, this false image would project a false shadow. False Gospels would make a false Church.

But the experience of nineteen centuries proves that the Church has this, and with this, all necessary for it.

The Church has no theory of inspiration.[1] Criticism is perpetually busy; it untwists every thread and fibre of the language of the Gospels. It seeks to read the mystery of their origin. But neither the recognition of Leading Ideas in the evangelists, nor any other result of study, disturbs this result. The Gospels are divine at least up to this point—that they present the Church sufficiently with the earthly life and teaching of her Master.

[1] See Note A, p. 296.

B

Our second inference regards the view of Jesus Christ presented to us by the evangelists through His life, as moulded for us by their Leading Ideas.

There is one current of thought in regard to existence which has come to us primarily perhaps from the East; but which, with Spinoza for its geometrician and Goethe for its prophet and poet, is now in the air we breathe.

Life is a strange and fatal gift. Each human existence is a frail and fleeting aspiration. Every successive life is a part of an unending ironical play of illusions, of which each gives a promise which it can never fulfil, and fades away in yet another disappointment. The absolute existence spends itself in filling up time with these ephemeral creations. The solution, we are told, is that this visible world is the only shrine of life and being; that the soul, the world, God, are different aspects of the one solitary existence.[1]

[1] This view has been given with the utmost clearness of which it is susceptible by a recent humorist poet.

"The Spirit of the World
Let a sardonic smile
For one short moment wander o'er his lips.
That smile was Mind—for its earthly hour
The strange guest sparkled; now 'tis passed away.

But in the Gospels is concentrated the manifestation of God made Man to us as personal individual beings. And the description of that manifestation is made more real and personal by the application to it of the Leading Ideas of the evangelists. Thus Christ appeals most effectually to creatures so various in temperament and circumstances—moulded by such different trainings—attracted by such different qualities. Jew or Gentile; the lover of power, of beauty and sympathy, of lofty idealism; the Christ of the evangelists speaks to all. He seems to say to the sons of men—"as I dealt with men and women in the Gospels; as I took

> "That was Heine! and we,
> Myriads who live, who have lived,
> What are we all but a mood,
> A single mood, of the life,
> *Of the spirit in whom we exist,*
> *Who alone is all things in me.*
>
> "Spirit, who sifted us all!
> Spirit, who interest in each
> New-coming son of mankind
> Such of thy thoughts as thou will!
> O thou, one of whose moods,
> Bitter and strange was the life
> Of Heine . . . .
> Meet thou a mood more serene,
> Happier, have utter'd in mine!
> Made it a ray of thy thought,
> Made it a beat of thy joy."

(Poems by Matthew Arnold. Second Volume. *Heine's Grave.* Pp. 263–266.)

the sick and sinful by the hand; so "I bring you health and cure, and I will cure you, and I will reveal unto you abundance of peace and truth."[1] As many were ungrateful then in the days of My flesh,[2] so is it ever. Yet each one of you separately is dear to Me."

In this sad world one thing and one only is permanent—one thing and one thing only saves us from the Pantheistic philosophy of despair. Jesus is "yesterday and to-day the same—aye, and unto the ages."[3] The reality of His earthly history is the guarantee of the reality of His heavenly working; and the reality as well as the variety of His earthly history is brought out pre-eminently by the Leading Ideas from which the evangelists have contemplated it.

In truth, the writer of this book at its close seems to have a stronger assurance of the *reality* of the history in the Evangelists than he had when he began.

For it seems to be undeniable from the Acts of the Apostles that the Church went forth to the world with a definitely moulded oral Gospel anterior to any other which we now possess. This would very early be reduced to a written form,

[1] Jeremiah xxxiii. 6.

[2] St. Luke iv. 41; xvii. 17; St. Matthew xxiii. 37.

[3] Hebrews xiii. 8. For *ἀιών cf.* Hebrews i. 12. *Cf.* Psalm ciii. 27. (LXX.)

and here we should have the common basis; the common "corpuscula historiæ evangelicæ" undeniably to be found in the synoptical Evangelists[1]

Now, with this common ground of Divine facts and words, three men are found at a very early date who take possession of this fund of common information, and treat it each from his several points of view with a noble and fearless freedom. This intrusion of individual thought and handling must have been prompted by the irresistible preoccupation of the writer, or by his preoccupation with a special public, or by a combination of both motives.

But, if each of these writers had an imperious, irresistible preconception of the character, work, usage, and words of Christ, from whence did he derive it? How was it that he was equipped with a view of Christ, with a knowledge of His life and words distinct from the common fund in the common abbreviated and irreducible minimum of the skeleton-Gospel? Where did he get it?

Not from his own imagination. Reverence would have staid his hand. Incapacity would have enfeebled it. The Evangelist would not have invented a Gospel, if he could; he could not, if he would. To have done so would have proved him to be almost the equal of his subject.

[1] See the "primitive Gospel" in Acts x. 33, 34 *cf. supra*, pp. 4, 499.

Thus the study of the Leading Ideas of the Gospels brings us to the most probable, to the only probable solution of the great problem, and leaves us with the only and simple cause full before us. The Evangelists wrote the earthly history of One whom they had known, whom they had seen and heard personally with more or less completeness, and of whom they could learn much from contemporary witnesses and memoirs.

NOTES

NOTE A

NEARLY all that can substantially be said upon this question was said by Cardinal Newman fifty years ago, with that almost prophetic insight into the course of modern religious speculation which he often exhibited. Writing upon a subject at that time scarcely thought of by English theologians, he observed:—

"In this point of view, we may, without irreverence, speak even of the words of inspired Scripture as imperfect and defective. Inspiration is defective, not in itself, but in consequence of the medium it uses and the beings whom it addresses. It uses human language, and it addresses man; and neither can man compass, nor can his hearers comprehend, the mysteries of the spiritual world and God's dealings in this. This vast and intricate scene of things cannot be generalized or represented through or to the mind of man. And inspiration, in undertaking to do so, *necessarily leaves what is divine to raise what is human*, sooner than we should know nothing. Almighty God has condescended to speak to us, so far as human thought and language will admit, by *approximation*, in order to give us practical rules for our own conduct. Herein consists one great blessing of the Gospel Covenant, that in Christ's death and in other parts of the economy, are concentrated, as it were, and so presented to us those attributes and works which fill eternity. And,

with a like graciousness, we are also told, in human language, concerning His Son and His Spirit, and concerning His Son's Incarnation."

NEWMAN's *Sermons before the University of Oxford*. Sermon xii. 264-266.

NOTE B

St. Luke xxiv. 13-36.

We have here a *personal* attestation—*probably* the attestation of St. Luke himself (though he was not necessarily for our purposes), The question has often been asked whether St. Luke was one of the seventy disciples. Quite clearly he could not have been one of the "eye-witnesses from the *beginning*," from whom he separates himself in the first sentence of his Gospel. Yet the wide-spread tradition that he was a personal follower, and in some sense a personal disciple of Jesus, must have had some substantial basis. This may well have been the record of the Easter walk to Emmaus.[1]

We are entitled to ask how the facts *could* have been written by any but an eye-witness, or by one who moulded his history from the lips of, or from a document supplied by, an eye-witness?

There are *literary* no less than *physical* impossibilities. One is often led to wish that the instructive Introductions prefixed by Sir Walter Scott to some of his novels were as much read as they deserve. In the Introduction to the *Monastery* Scott confesses the failure of the White Lady of Avenel. He proceeds to assert the inevitable breakdown of "supernatural machinery" in fiction. He seems inclined to except almost alone Ariel, that beautiful creation of Shakespeare's fancy. He might have added that Shakespeare himself is not successful when he advances beyond astral or fairy beings, varying, capricious, inconstant, yet not altogether unkindly. In *Hamlet* the impression produced by the Ghost upon those who behold him is given with an awful majesty unsurpassed

[1] St. Luke xxiv. 13-40.

in human literature; but the Ghost's own language is by no means equal.[1]

Is it not, then, what we have called a *literary impertinence*, that the company of Guildenstern could have supplied a writer thus perfectly and equally at home with the majesty of style of a risen God? More especially so as the writer would not have been satisfied by the strong tide of imagination which buoys up the inventor of a happy fiction, but depressed by the leaden weight which a forger drags at his ankles. He would not have been borne by the storm-forced steeds of enthusiasm, but by the dull hoofs which every lie is forced to employ. Indeed, if some forgotten Shakespeare had existed among that simple company, no degree of genius could have enabled him to move securely and gracefully on ranges so high and difficult. No one, therefore, who was not present—supposing that he could have told so naturally about the *feelings*[2] as well as words and actions of the two—could have invented those inimitable sentences and placed them in the lips of Jesus.

[1] MAR. "Speak to it, Horatio."
HOR. "*What art thou that usurp'st this time of night,*
Together with that fair and warlike form
In which the majesty of buried Denmark
Did sometime march?"
MAR. "*Wo do it wrong, being so majestical,*
To offer it the show of violence."
BER. "It was about to speak, when the cock crew."
HOR. "*And then it started, like a guilty thing*
Upon a fearful summons."

The language of the Ghost (Act I. Scene 5) is not maintained throughout at all at the same high level.

[2] St. Luke xxiv. 32.

NOTE C

ἤρξατο πράσσειν καὶ διδάσκειν. St. Luke ii. 52.

We may quote a fine and stately piece of psychology by an eminent living writer.

"The life of Jesus as a boy and youth at Nazareth is told in the words—'He grew'; He obeyed.[1] There was nothing extraordinary, nothing startling, nothing apparently outside the lines of human nature. He develops physically like other children. He shows, from year to year, the intelligence and the virtues, the grace and the charm which are suitable to His age. No obstacle thwarts this perfect growth. The passions, as they awake, have a tumult and an effervescence which disturb the harmony of every human being. But in the soul of Jesus they are in perfect equilibrium. Evil in any form never even touches the Holy Thing which is born, in whom dwelleth in bodily wise the fulness of God. In Him matter is penetrated by his soul, which sways and transfigures it; and the soul by the Spirit of God, which fills and makes it divine. No psychology can analyze the irradiations of God in the soul of Jesus; no science will ever grasp the beauty of that body vibrating and growing up under the rays and impulses of a soul which the Infinite pervades with His beauty and grace. His life is the ideal youth and youth, as presently He will be the ideal man. There is this difference between Him and the sons of earth—that the best of us aspire to an ideal perfection which we never reach, while He realizes the absolute type. The total Personal union of the human and divine Nature gave Him the intuition of infinite truth, the possession of infinite love, the unbroken enjoyment of infinite beauty; but it did not hinder the development of experimental knowledge in its realm; nor, again, the progressive exercise of virtues, the effort of the will, may more than bodily fatigues, labour, and pain. This is the essential appanage of the earthly man. Jesus willed to have it whole and entire, with its weakness, its misery, and its sorrows. Not

[1] Fairbairn. *Jesus Christ*, lib. i. chap. v. pp. 70-79. *On the Adolescence and Youth of Jesus.*

His union with God excepted Him from nothing but sin and imperfection. The most different moods could co-exist simultaneously in His soul without moral collision or destruction. His intuition is compatible with experimental knowledge. His divine joys are allied to ceaseless sufferings, and His most painful struggles to an unshirkable serenity."

I

This is the *Sense* of Aquinas, and of Aquinas where he is at his best.

The substance of the teaching of Aquinas upon the God-Man's increase in wisdom seems to be as follows:—

Is there ignorance in Christ?

In the affirmative it may be argued—

1. Christ on earth had what united the Human, not the Divine Nature, such as suffering and death.

2. One may be called ignorant from any defect of knowledge. And Christ knew not sin (2 Corinthians v. 21).

But the negative is ruled, for—

"*Ignorantia per ignorantiam non tollitur.*" But Christ came to take away our ignorance as well as our sin. As for the last purpose there could be in Him no "fomes peccati," so for the first there could be no ignorance.

As to Christ's Humanity, it may be considered (*a*) *per se*—from which point of view it may be looked upon as ignorant and sentiv, or (*b*) as united with the Divine Personality, and "full of grace and truth" (St. John i. 14).

So far as ignorance can be predicated of Him, it can only be *per experientiam*. He knows absolutely *per simplicem notitiam*. (St. THOMAS AQUINAS. Pars III. Quest. xv. Art. ii. [4] "Utrum in Christo fuit ignorantia"), *Summa Theolog.* Tom. iv. pp. 66, 67.)

II

Whether Christ knew all things in regard to infused knowledge?

A double knowledge was impressed on the soul of Christ, each most perfect in its own way. (*a*) The first exceeded human nature,

wherewith He saw the essence of God, and all things in It. This is simply most perfect. (*b*) There was another knowledge in Christ in a way proportionate to human nature, as He knew things *per species*. This was not *absolutely* most perfect, but most perfect *relatively* to human knowledge.

Obj. "Then was in Christ a certain knowledge acquired by experience. But He did not experience all things. Therefore He did not know all things in this way."

But if He was not "*omnia experiens*" yet from that which He did experimentally know, He had knowledge of all things.

"Jesus increased in wisdom" (St. Luke ii. 51). Merely human wisdom is wisdom acquired in human methods. "Scientia acquisita crescitur ab intellectu agente qui non simul totum opuatur, sed successive. Secundum hanc scientiam Christus non a principio scivit omnia sed paulatim." (Pars iii. Quæst. xii. Tom. iv. § 3a.)

"Hæc scientia fuit perfecta secundum *tempus*: licet non *semper fuerit perfecta simpliciter et secundum naturam*. Ideo potuit habere augmentum." (*Ibid.* § 6a.) Pars iii. Art. iv. Quæst. xi.

"De scientia indiff vel infusa anima Christi."—Tom. iv. §§ 56–60. D. THOM. *Summa, Theologi, cum Comment. Cajetani.*

ADDITIONAL NOTES

NOTE A (p. 8).

INDICATIONS OF THE STYLE AND TONE OF ST. LUKE IN THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE fact of striking resemblances of style and expression between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the writings of St. Luke has been recognized for ages in the Christian Church.

All the earliest existing authorities attribute the Epistle to St. Paul. But doubts upon the subject begin with the beginnings of criticism. Clement of Alexandria and Origen[1] perceived a certain

[1] The passages in Eusebius run thus: "But the Epistle to the Hebrews [Clement in his *Hypotyposes*] affirms to be Paul's, but that it was written to Hebrews in the Hebrew language, whilst Luke, eminent of the honour [*φιλοτιμία*], translated and published it for Greeks. Hence careful examination discovers the same colouring of style in the translated epistle as in the Acts; but that the aural 'Paul Apostle' is not prefixed naturally enough." "For" (says Clement), "in writing an Epistle to Hebrews, who were prejudiced against him and suspected him, he very prudently did not revolt them in the subject by giving his name." Clement then adds a suggestion. "Now then" (the writer), "as the blessed elder [πρεσβὺς Παῦλος] said, since the Lord, as Apostle of the Most High, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul as having been sent to the Gentiles, through humility does not describe himself as apostle of the Hebrews, both for the sake of giving honour to the Lord, and

[2] Gk. ἐξ, apparently meeting a fresh difficulty of his day. See WESTCOTT, *Epistle to Hebrews*, lxvii.

unlikeness to St. Paul's tone and thought. They account for the phenomena by supposing that the Epistle is *Pauline* but not *Paul's*. They conjecture that there was possibly a Hebrew original translated into Greek by St. Luke (or by St. Clement of Rome); possibly a joint collaboration, to which St. Paul contributed the argument or general design, while St. Luke or St. Clement put the pieces in shape in the Greek language, working freely within the lines indicated by the Apostle.

"The particular criticism of which we are speaking," writes Dr. Vaughan, "has taken no step, certainly no stride, towards finality, since the age of Clement and Origen." (*Epistle to Hebrews. Pref.* xiii.) Yet we venture to think that the great scholar has under-

on account of its seeming a possibly ostensatious superfluity that one who wrote so well and had the Greeks to compel wise consultancy to the Hebrews also." (Eusch. *H. E.* vi. 14.) [Origen writes] "Every juicy title of *mastery* of style next afield that the literary character of the Epistle to the Hebrews does not possess the unmistakable individuality of the apostle, who confessed that he was rude in speech, that is in verbal phase, while the Epistle is of a higher and purer ease of Hellenic diction. But on the other hand, such a critic would say the thoughts of the Epistle are of wonderful depth and elevation, and in no way second to the Apostolic writings."

To this Origen afterwards appends: "But I would add my own opinion that the conceptions are those of the Apostle; but the phrase and the literary style belong to some one putting forth as in a memoir that to which he was prompted by his teacher. If, then, any Church holds the Epistle for Paul's, let this Church be approved even for this; for the ancients did not rashly hand it down as Paul's. But, as to the question who wrote it, God knows the truth of the matter; but the history of it, as it came down to us, was according to some, that Clement, who became Bishop of the Romans, wrote it, but according to others Luke, the author of the Gospel and the Acts." (Eusch. *H. E.* vi. 25.) This passage of Origen was written after A.D. 245. The opinion of Eusebius himself is against the Lucanian, and for the Clementine origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (*H. E.* iii. 38.)

estimated the evidence produced by Dr. Franz Delitzsch, throughout the *Commentary upon the Epistle to the Hebrews*, which will probably remain the first authority upon the subject, and especially in the dissertation as to the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Clement *on the Hebrews*, E.T. Vol. ii. 409–418.)

We proceed to consider the affinities between the acknowledged writings of St. Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews under three heads

(i) Resemblances in style, expression, and construction.

(ii) Resemblances in a common *celebration* of study and habitual thought, manifesting itself in illustrations, and in the form and colour which they assume.

(iii) Resemblances in theological ideas and Christological conceptions.

I

Resemblances in style, expression, and construction.

These resemblances can only be satisfactorily exhibited by being presented to the eye at length in opposite columns. They are certainly very numerous, when we consider the difference between historical documents and a theological treatise. Instances where words, expressions, and construction are peculiar to the three books in the N.T., are marked with asterisks.

EPISTLE TO HEBREWS	ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL AND ACTS
διαφερόντως καὶ αὐτοῦ ... ὄνομα (Hebrews i. 4 (*cf.* iii. 3) ix. 23; xi. 4; xii. 24).	*πλείον καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ διαστρέψαν ὄνομα* (Acts. St. Luke iii. 13. (Tense of καὶ, after compar., absolutely peculiar in N.T.)
μετέχω. Hebrews i. 9 (*cf.* iii. 1, 14; vi. 4; xii. 8).	*μετέχω.* St. Luke v. 7.
πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως. Hebrews i. 11 (*cf.* viii. 13).	*βαλλόντων μὲ πολλοὶ πολυτρόπως.* St. Luke xii. 33.

ἔχουσι. Hebrews i. 11.

πίστιν ἔχοντες. Hebrews i. 6. (St. Luke ii. 12: iv. 5: xxi. 26: Acts xi. 28: xvii. 31: xix. 27: xxiv. 8: Hebrews ii. 8.)

τοῦ λειτουργεῖν (= προσέρχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ κτλ). Hebrews ii. 2.

σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, κ.τ.λ. Hebrews ii. 4.

Εἰ κύριε μόνον. Hebrews ii. 4.

ὁ τὸν τῆς ἀγάλλου καὶ ἀγγελοῦμεν ἐν ὑμῖν πάντες. Hebrews ii. 11.

τοῦ λειτουργεῖν.

τόμοι. St. Luke iv. 18: Acts iv. 27: x. 38. [Only found elsewhere in 2 Cor. i. 1.]

πίστιν. Elsewhere only Matt. xxiv. 14: Rom. x. 18: Apoc. iii. 10: xiii. 10: xiv. 14.

προσέρχεσθαι τοῖς λειτουργοῦσι (Acts xxvi. 14): cf. Acts viii. 6, 10, 11. [*Προσέρχομαι* is a favourite word with St. Luke. Paul only uses it in the Past. Epp.." (Deißmann.)

Acts iii. 19, 26, 43: iv. 30: v. 12: vi. 8: vii. 36: xiv. 3: xv. 12.

Cf. Acts iii. 5.

Cf. τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θεοῦ. St. Luke iii. 38.

εὐαγγελίζω, nowhere in St. Luke's acknowledged writings (xix. Acts xx. 7: xx. 24, both *Pauline*). Such paraphrases or synonyms are Luzan.

ἐλέγξαι τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀγρίλλω. Acts viii. 53. [This is *Pauline* also. Galatians iii. 19. But it may be yet another evidence of the spell which the angelic ministrations exercised over St. Luke. *Cf.* Acts vii. 30–38.]

ὁ δὲ ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος. Hebrews ii. 2.

τηλικούτου σωτηρίας. Hebrews ii. 3.

συνεπιμαρτυρούντος. Hebrews ii. 4.

διαμερισμοῖς. ii. 6.

τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας. Hebrews ii. 10; *cf.* xii. 2.

κατάπαυσιν. Hebrews iii. 11, 18; iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11. Hebrews iii. 17 is throughout Latin.

(a) *ἔθνος* in *logical* sense; iii. 1; vii. 25; viii. 3; ix. 18.

τίνες ἀκούσαντες.

(c) οἱ τὸν ἐλέγξαντα τῶν χρηματίσαντα πολύ μᾶλλον.

(d) οὐκ ἐκείνοι.

(e) τὰ ἔργα ἀπὸ.

μόνον. Hebrews iii. 1–14; vi. 4; xii. 8.

κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπ. καὶ ἀρχ. τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, iii. 1; x. 24 (= prolonged and searching contemplation).

ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης. Acts xiii. 26. For St. Luke's idea of the Gospel as salvation, *cf.* St. Luke i. 69, 71, 77; Acts ii. 47; iv. 12, with Hebrews i. 14; ii. 10; v. 9; vi. 9; ix. 28.

Doubly compound verbs of this character are Lucan. *Cf.* συνεπιτίθεσθαι, Acts xxiv. 9.

St. Luke viii. 28; Acts ii. 40; xiii. 25; x. 42; xviii. 5; xx. 23, 24; xxviii. 23 (rare in St. Paul).

τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς. Acts iii. 15; v. 31.

Acts vii. 44.

(a) Acts xxvi. 19 (never in St. Paul's writings).

τίνες ἀκούσαντες παρεπικράνθησαν. Acts xiv. 11.

(c) ὁ θεὸς ἐμπαίκτοις μυκτηρίζεται. Acts xiv. 11.

(e) τὰ ἔργα St. Luke xiv. 26–32; xix. 42; Acts xxviii. 10.

St. Luke v. 7.

St. Luke v. 71 vi. 41; xii. 24–27; Acts vii. 32; xi. 6; xxvii. 39.

ἔτυχε κληρονομῆσαι. (iv. 2, 6, pass. of persons to whom the proclamation is made).

τελείωσιν ἔνεξ. Hebrews iv. 12.

ἔργων κόρεῖν. Hebrews iv. 16.

"Use of ev. Hebrews ix. 16.

ἐνεβάσασε. Hebrews iv. 16.

ἀνεμίκτοις ἀκθέσεσε. Heb. v. 2.

Hebrews v. 7.

ἀπὸ τῆς κλεισθέισε. Hebrews v. 7 (xii. 28).

(*ἀ*) *ἀπὸ* = "source whence."

"ἐξ κλεισθέισε.

μετανοίαν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. Hebrews vi. 1.

πίστεωσ ἐπ' θεὸν. Ibid.

φορέμενα. Hebrews vi. 1.

τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμβάσαντα ὑετὸν. Hebrews vi. 7.

"εἰδέσεν. Ibid.

ἐξ ἑνὸσ σωτηρίαν. Hebrews vi. 9.

φρονεῖσεν ἀνόμωσ. St. Luke vii. 22.

ἀγαπωμένοσ ὑπὸ. St. Luke xvi. 8.

"St. Luke i. 30; Acts vii. 46.

St. Luke xxiv. 20; Acts xxvi. 20.

"Acts xxvii. 17.

"St. Luke xxii. 21 Acts xxvii. 20.

St. Luke xxii. 39-46.

St. Luke xix. 3; xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; xx. 9; xxii. 11.

"κλεισθέισε, κλεισθέισεσι, κλεισθέισ. [About 30 times in LXX. Never in N.T. except Hebrews v. 7; xii. 28; xi. 7. St. Luke ii. 25 Acts xxiii. 10; i. 5; viii. 2; xxii. 12.]

μετανοίαν εἰσ ἀνὰ νῦν κοῦσεσ σεω. Acts viii. 22.

ἐκστάσεωσ ἐμί. Acts iii. 42; xi. 17; xvi. 31; xviii. 9.

CC Acts xx. 15, 17.

ἐμβάσεν ἔμχστοσ. (St. Luke xii. 54.)

"St. Luke ix. 62; xiv. 35.

ἀ ἀγωνίσεν = text follows: chap. (St. Luke xiii. 33). Acts xx. 15; xxi. 21.

καὶ οὐδενὸς εἶχε μαίζονα ἐμόσαι. Hebrews vi. 13. (a) **εἶχε** = *ἔχει* with infin. = "to have wherewith to do an act." (b) **ἐμόσαι.**

κατοφγόνεον. Heb. vi. 18.

πρηγμάτων = facts, actions. Heb. vi. 18.

τῶν ἀνω τὰ κάτω. Hebrews vi. 17.

ἀκρόπολιν τὴν ἐλπίδα. Hebrews vi. 19.

ἐν ὑψηγορίᾳ φωνῆς τὴν ἀφωνίᾳ. Hebrews vi. 19.

τοῦ ἀνω τοῦ ὑψίστου. Hebrews vii. 1.

ἐπαγωγίας. Hebrews vii. 4.

μαρτυρούμενος = "one to whom witness is borne." Hebrews vii. 8; xi. 2, 4, 39.

ἀμετάπτωτον. Hebrews vii. 5.

ἄκρατος = "higher and third aspect of human generation." Hebrews vii. 5, 10.

ἀνωφελὲς. Hebrews vii. 1-10.

ἔσται. Hebrews vii. 25. [Rare in N.T.]

τὸν τὸν παντελῆ. Hebrews vii. 25.

τετελειωμένον. Hebrews vii. 11.

αἷς ἐχρῆσθαι. Hebrews vii. 27.

(c) St. Luke viii. 42: xii. 42: xiv. 14. Acts iv. 14: xxv. 26. (d) God's oath. St. Luke i. 73: Acts vii. 17.

*Acts xiv. 6.

* St. Luke i. 1: Acts v. 4.

*Βασιλὴς for God's will. St. Luke vii. 30. Acts ii. 23: iv. 28: xiii. 36: xx. 27. (Only more than used by St. *Paul*. Ephes. v. 17.)

*Acts xxvii. 29, 30, 42.

St. Luke viii. 28: Acts xvi. 17.

*Acts ii. 29: vii. 8, 9.

Acts vi. 31, 33: x. 22: xvi. 2: xxii. 12.

* St. Luke i. 9.

* Acts ii. 20.

*St. Luke ix. 37: Acts x. 25: xx. 22.

Acts ii. 37: viii. 34. 35 ἐπέφερον. St. Luke i. 75.]

*St. Luke viii. 1.

*St. Luke i. 45.

St. Luke xiv. 18: xxiii. 17 (omitted in several MSS.): 1 Corinthians vii. 37, same words but in different sense.

τὸν κυριεύσαντα ἀλληλοῖς. Hebrews viii. 2.

λατρεύοντες. Hebrews viii. 5; ix. 9, 14; x. 2; xii. 28; xiii. 10.

πολύμερως καὶ πολυτρόπως ἐκείνοις, κ.τ.λ. Hebrews viii. 5 (from Exodus xxv. 40; cf. xxv. 9; xxvi. 30, LXX.).

εἰς τὸ κ. σκευὴ εἰσίασιν. Hebrews ix. 6.

Ἅπαξ. Hebrews ix. 12.

τὸν διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. Hebrews ix. 12; xiii. 12.

τὸν αἷμα ... πάσης. Hebrews ix. 22.

χειροποίητα. Hebrews ix. 24 (*cf.* x. 11).

εἰς ἐμφανισθῆναι. Hebrews ix. 24 (*cf.* xi. 14).

ἐπιστρέφει. Hebrews x. 8.

θέλημα. Hebrews x. 11.

τέλειοι πεφόρηται. Hebrews x. 20.

εἰς παρρησίαν ἀγόμενοι. Hebrews x. 24.

St. John xvi. 11. [Only places outside the Johannic group, where *ἐκβάλλω* occurs (exc. 1 Thessalonians i. 9).]

St. Luke i. 74; ii. 37; iv. 8; Acts vii. 7-42; xviii. 14; xxvi. 71; xxviii. 23. [Rare in N.T. outside Lucan group.]

[Acts vii. 44.

[Acts iii. 31; xxi. 18-26.

[St. Luke i. 68; ii. 38 (*cf.* *λυτρωτής*, Acts vii. 35). [Always *ἐλευθέρα ἀπολύτρωσις.*]

[Acts xxv. 26.

[Acts xiii. 14 (*κρεῖσσον κάθου ἡ κάθωμαι*) xiii. 20 (*ἐγγὺς κάθου τῶν Ἑλλήνων*).

Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24. [Precisely—not exclusively—Lucan.]

Acts xiii. 17-22; xxiv. 17; xxv. 2, 15 (also in St. Matthew and St. John).

St. Luke xiv. 10.

St. Luke v. 17.

Acts viii. 2.

[Acts xxv. 30.

φαίδρα τε. Hebrews x. 27. Acts v. 36; viii. 9 (rhetorical appositeness).

ἔκφοβος. Hebrews x. 34. τὴν ἁρπαγὴν ὑπήρχετε. Acts ii. 45 (with the τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ... ὑπήρχουν ὑπαρξίν and ὑπήρχον, Hebrews x. 34); cf. St. Luke xii. 15; xvi. 12, of which it is the echo in language and thought.

εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς. Hebrews x. 39. Exact correspondence in thought with St. Luke xxi. 19; cf. xvii. 33; xxi. 19 (see Vaughan, *Epistle to Hebrews*, 209-212).

νεῦ μὴ ἴδοῖν. Hebrews xi. 5 (v. 7). ["General construction with entire clause = design is peculiar to Luke and Paul." Winer. Pt. iii. § xliv. 4.] St. Luke ii. 27; v. 7; xix. 12-28; xxiv. 31; Acts iii. 2; xxvi. 18.

τῶν ἀδάκρυον. Hebrews xi. 5. St. Luke xxiv. 18.

παρέρχομαι. Hebrews xi. 9. St. Luke xii. 12; viii. 22; ix. 58. [It is applied to now in the Lucan group only. To the Everlasting Sun by St. John only, i. 14-18; ii. 16-18; i St. John iv. 9.]

μετοικεσία. Hebrews xi. 12. St. Luke xii. 15; viii. 42; xix. 41; Acts vii. 4; xiii. 17; xxiii. 29; xxiv. 18; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 17.

ἀστεῖον τὸ παιδίον. Hebrews xi. 23. Acts vii. 20 [also of Moses].

τὴν βασιλέως ἀλλαγήν. Hebrews xi. 29. Acts vii. 36.

μετ' εἰρήνης. Hebrews xii. 31. Acts xv. 33.

ἀνάβασις ἀκρόβυστος. Hebrews xi. 34. St. Luke xxi. 24.

ἀγράμματοι ἰδιῶται. Hebrews xi. 33. Acts x. 35.

ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωμεν. Hebrews xi. 35.

ἀντιλογίας. Hebrews xii. 3.

τὸν παρακαλοῦντα ὑπὲρ. Σαλὰ γενναι. Hebrews xii. 5.

(c) *παράκλησις.*

(d) *διαλογισμὸς* = course of argument mingled with appeal.

ἕνα φύσεως. Hebrews xii. 13 (Deuteronomy xxix. 17).

μετανοίας τόπον...ἐκζητήσας μετὰ δακρύων, κ.τ.λ. Hebrews xii. 17 : Hebrews xii. 12.

(e) *μετανοίας τόπος.*

(f) *μετὰ δακρύων.* Hebrews xii. 17 (v. 7).

ἔστρωται. Hebrews xii. 21. [Added by the sacred writer to the *Septuagint* of Deuteronomy ix. 19 (LXX.).]

μετρ. τὸν ὑψοῦντα ἡμᾶς, οὗτινος ἐλάλησεν ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, κ.τ.λ. Hebrews xii. 7.

(g) *ὑψοῦμαι* = spiritual chief. Hebrews xiii. 7, 17, 24.

(h) *ἐλάλησεν τὸν λόγον.*

τεταγμένοι εἰς ἀναστάσεις, κ.τ.λ. St. Luke xx. 35.

σωμάτων ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι. St. Luke ii. 34.

(i) St. Luke xii. 15 : xv. 31.

(k) Almost a new fact, cf St. Luke in Acts (Acts xviii. 9-17 : xviii. 4-19) xix. 8, 9 : xix. 1-9 : xxiii. 12-35).

φυὲν. St. Luke viii. 6, 8.

(l) τόπον ἀνάκλησις. Acts xxv. 16. In this sense exclusively Lucan.

*(m) Acts xx. 31. [The μετὰ δακρύων of Mark ix. 24 is rejected by the best authorities.] So R.V.

*Acts vii. 32 : xxii. 29.

(n) St. Luke xxii. 26 : Acts xiv. 12 : xv. 22.

(o) Acts iv. 33 : viii. 25 : xi. 19 : xiii. 46 : xvi. 6.

"ὁ ἀπαθανατίσας.

(ii) ἐνδυσα (as issue from life).

λογικὴν καὶ λόγου τῆς παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ διὰ βικαίου ἐνδυνεῖται ἡμῖν. Hebrews xiii. 22.

"λογικὴν = patient bearing. Gen. Hebrews xii. 2.

"λόγου παρακλήσεως, διὰ, ἐνδυνεῖται = information sent by Epistle. Ibid.

ἀπολελυμένον. Hebrews xiii. 23. The word must mean either (a) released from prison; or (b) sent out on mission; or (c) dismissed. All three are Lucan not Pauline.

"ἐξ ἀνὰ τὴν Τροάδα. Hebrews xiii. 24.

"Τροάδα. Hebrews xiii. 24. Adelaide.

"μνημονεύετε. Hebrews v. 2.

"κείρει. Hebrews iv. 3.

τὴν ἡ. τὴν ἀγ. is all but exclusively Lucan. Hebrews iii. 7 ix. 8; x. 15.

(ii) Acts xvii. 12.

(iii) Cf. Ἡρῴδου (St. Luke iv. 31) ἡμέρᾳ (Acts xx. 29), for the idea. [The ἐνδυνεῖ of St. Paul belongs to quite another conception. 1 Corinthians v. 13.]

"Acts viii. 14.

"Acts xiii. 15.

"Acts xv. 20; xxi. 25.

(c) St. Luke xxiii. 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25; Acts iii. 13; iv. 21; (b) Acts xiii. 3; (c) Acts xv. 30-33.

For construction cf. Acts v. 23, 28; xiii. 12; xxii. 13; xxi. 22.

"Acts xviii. 2; xxvii. 1-6.

"μετρίως is not to be found in the LXX.; in the N.T. also only in Acts xx. 12.

"Acts xiv. 17.

Luke ii. 26; iii. 4; Lucan i. 16; iv. 3; v. 32; xii. 51; xiii. 18; x. 44, 47; xi. 15; xiii. 23, 24; xv. 8; xix. 6; xx. 23, 28; xxi. 11; xxviii. [The only exceptions are Mark xiii. 18; John xiv. 26.]

"ὁ μὲν πλείονες εἰσι. Hebrews vii. 23.

πολίτας. Hebrews vii. 27.

"πανάγιον. Hebrews vii. 26.

"ἀνωφελὲς καὶ ἀσθενὲς. Hebrews vii. 12.

"ἀνεθέτησις. Hebrews vii. 17.

"ἐπαγωγὴ. Hebrews vii. 19.

"πολίτης. Hebrews viii. 11.

"ἀπρόσβατος. Hebrews viii. 11.

"κρείττων. Hebrews xii. 24.

"ἀπόβλεψις. Hebrews xii. 25.

"ἀπαγγέλλω. Hebrews xii. 28.

"ἀπόλαυσις. Hebrews xii. 28.

"ἀγάπη τῆς φιλαδελφίας. Hebrews xiii. 22.

"ἄφνω ἀδικα with ἀμαρτάδε. Hebrews ix. 22.

"ἐν δὲ, climactic. Hebrews xi. 36.

"ἀδιστακτεῖν. Hebrews xiii. 17.

Other instances are:—[1]

"τὸν. Ἀ. αἰτεῖν ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν, and v. 4 and 10.

πλείονες without genitive or comparative marks by 4, in the sense of "a large number," is exclusive Luca i 57. Acts viii. 31 x. xxi. 10 xxiv. 17 xxv. 14 xxvii. 13, 20 xxviii. 23.

"St. Luke xiii. 11.

"St. Luke v. 18, 24. Acts viii. 7 i. 13.

Acts xxviii. 7.

"St. Luke xi. 18.

"St. Luke xv. 15; xix. 14; Acts xxi. 19; Hebrews viii. 11.

"St. Luke xiii. 13; Acts xv. 16.

"St. Luke xvii. 12.

"St. Luke ix. 3, 5.

"Acts xxvii. 41.

"Acts xiii. 15.

"St. Luke iv. 18.

"St. Luke xii. 56; Acts ii. 26.

"ἀκατάπαυστος. St. Luke xvii. 2.

Acts xiv. 18. μᾶλλον κατάπαυσον τοὺς ὄχλους.

[1] For many of the following instances the writer is indebted to the Rev. W. K. Hobart, LL.D.

ᾖτε. 11. εἰς τὴν κατάκρισιν μου, and iii. 18; iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11.

ᾔτει. 12. τυμπάνων ἤκεν.

ᾔτει. 5. ἱερατεῖον λαμβάνουσι.

ᾔτει, and viii. 10. διατάσσεσθαι.

ᾔτεις. 13. τὸ δὲ κατακαίειν, and i. 11.

ᾔτεις. 13. πλήξαντα αὐτὰς ἔθετε.

ᾔτεις. 23. ἀπογογγυζομένων δὲ οἱῳσοῦν.

ᾔτεις. 28. βασιλεῖα δράκοντα.

ᾔτεις. 16. εἰς εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν.

ᾔτεις. 19. εἰς τὸ ἐνέστηκον τοῦ κατασκεύαζεν.

ᾔτεις. 29. ἐξωθέσθαι τιμωρίαν.

ᾔτεις. 17. νῦν ἐκφεύγειν ἐπιβόλλεσθαι.

ᾔτεις. 36. μάστιγ = scourging.

ᾔτεις. 2. ἐνεδρεύσαν ἀγγέλοις.

Acts vii. 49. τίνος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου.

St. Luke xvi. 8. φρονιμώτεροι ἦσαν.

St. Luke i. 9. κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατείας, and iv. 19 ἐνιαυτὸν κύριον. St. Luke i. 8.

Acts iii. 25; St. Luke xxii. 29.

St. Luke xii. 33. βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα.

St. Luke xvii. 22. εἰ ἐπιθυμεῖτε πλέξαιτε.

St. Luke ii. 1, 3. 5; and ἀπογραφή. St. Luke i. 5; Acts v. 37.

Acts xxvi. 41. ἡμέρον ἀκάθαρτον.

Acts xxviii. 17. βασιλεῖα ἐγκάθετο.

Acts xvi. 24. εἰς τὴν ἐνωτάτην φυλακήν.

Acts xxii. 5. ἄξων . . . ἵνα τιμωρηθοῦν, and xxvi. 11.

Acts xxviii. 7. ἀπαλλάξωμεν ἡμᾶς.

Acts xxii. 24.

Acts xxviii. 7. φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισαν, and v. 6, 18, 23, 32; xxii. 20; xxi. 16.

In 1 Peter ii. 4 and 1 Peter ii. 5 and 1 Corinthians xvi. 19) is an addition to the text.

ᾔτει. 29. διέβρεον τὴν ἀγκύραν βάλλοντες.

Acts xxvii. 9. βοηθεῖν τὴν Μακεδονίαν, and St. Luke xv. 15.

ix. 10, πλάνωνται ἄχρι.

Acts ii. 2, ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἤχου, and St. Luke v. 37.

xii. 16, ἀνέῳξεν τὸν πρωτοτόκον.

Acts viii. 9, νὺν τὸν ἴδιον ἀνέῳξεν.

The only places where ἀποδίδοσθαι in the middle is used, and = to sell.

Ἀποδόμενος, xiii. 7; πολίσματα, viii. 11; ἀποτάξασθαι, xiii. 22; ἔρῳτα, viii. 8; κάτω, iv. 3.

xi. 30, ἐπὶ ἐπτὰ ἡμέρας.

ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. St. Matthew ix. 15.

ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγρόν. St. Mark xiv. 1.

ἐφ' ἕνα χρόνον (3). Romans vii. 1. ἐφ' ἅπαξ κιρί, vi. 15. ἐφ' ἕνα χρόνον (3). 1 Corinthians vii. 29. ἐφ' ἕνα χρόνον κιρίαν ἔστιν. Galatians iv. 1.

2 Peter i. 13, ἐφ' ἕνον κιρί.

ἐκλείσθη ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία. St. Luke iv. 25; ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον, iv. 35; ἐπὶ χρόνον, xviii. 4. Acts iii. 1, ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς; iv. 5, ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον συναχθῆναι; xiii. 31, ἐφάνη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους; xiii. 18, ἐτροποφόρησεν ἐπὶ τοῦτον χρόνον μόνον; xix. 8, ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς διελέγετο; xix. 10, ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο; xix. 34, ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο κραύγασε; xx. 11, ὁμιλήσας τε ἐπὶ πλείστον; xxvii. 20, ἐπὶ πολύτατον ἡμέρας; xxviii. 6, ἐπὶ πολύ.

It is after St. Luke's manner to express duration of time by ἐπί with the accusative.

ἐπτά, i. κεφάλαια, and Acts xxii. 28.

τρ. ἄφῳξαν. Six times in St. Luke, only once elsewhere, Romans i. 4.

xi. 10, τερφήσονται, and Acts xiii. 34, 35. Once elsewhere, Revelation xviii. 22.

xi. 18, φόβηθῆν. St. Luke xxiv. 37; Acts xxii. 27; and 1 John i. 1.

xi. 34 and xiii. 11-13, πεφωβῆσθ. Six times in Acts, once in Revelation xv. 4.

xi. 26, ὁ κύριος, with reference to our Lord, is never so used by St. Paul, frequently by St. Luke. Used also by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Peter, but not by St. John.

(1. 1. ἀκούω. Affird (in his marginal reference) says "if divine

revelations," ch. ii. 2, 3; iii. 5; v. 5; xi. 18. See also vii. 14; ix. 19; xii. 24, 25. See also St. Luke i. 45, 70; xxiv. 25. Acts iii. 21, 24; viii. 6, 38, 42; viii. 26; x. 7; xviii. 9. Never in St. Paul.)

ἀποδιδόναι, xi. 15. St. Luke x. 6, Acts xviii. 21, and St. Matthew ii. 12 only.

διαλέγεσθαι, xii. 5. Ten times in Acts, once in St. Matthew, and once in Jude only.

ἐκβάλλειν. Hebrews xi. 6, St. Luke ii. 50, 51, and 1 Peter i. 10 (Acts xvi. 17 and Romans iii. 11 being quotations from LXX.).

κοσμεῖν. Hebrews xi. 30, St. Luke xxi. 20, Acts xxv. 20. Once in St. John xiv. 2, perhaps in Revelation xx. 2.

περιέρχεσθαι, xi. 37. Acts xix. 13, xxviii. 3, and 1 Timothy v. 13.

II

We proceed to point out resemblances between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the two historical treatises of St. Luke in apparently common studies and pursuits, which supply the colouring-matter that tingles illustrations and forms of expression. The professional man is not completely lost in the historian, or even in the theologian.

In St. Luke's admitted writings there are two leading veins, of which one is *medical*, the other *psychological*.

A

Traces of medical preparation and knowledge in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It does not require more than a moderate degree of study to make it evident that the contents of the Epistle to the Hebrews succeed with the notion that his author (whoever he may have been) must have had a good share of the medical training of his age.

Delitzsch points out happily that the Epistle contains:

(*a*) An *embroiled* passage (ii. 12, 13).

(*b*) A *victim* passage (v. 12-14).

(*c*) A *therapeutic* passage (xii. 11-13).

It must be confessed, however, that this great scholar has given a singularly meagre and unsatisfactory list of particulars to fill in the *programma*.[1]

The kindness of the Rev. W. K. Hobart, LL.D., has supplied the writer with the following list of medical words in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is no small advantage to have had this task performed by the living scholar who has made the works of the Greek medical school his especial study, and has already carried the comparison between their language and that of St. Luke further than any other critic.

Hebrews ii. 12, *κυκλόσε ἐστὶν κἀκεῖνα κἀκεῖνα θέτειν*, note the contrast between *κυκλόσε* and *ἐν τοῖσδε* just before.

κόμμα is employed by Homer (*Il.* xv. 844), *κεκόμμα* and *κεκόμμη* by Hippocrates and Galen for the wrists and its sprains. These names were of various shapes, two-edged as here, *μονόκοπτον δυόκοπτον* (Galen x. 45, Kühn); *μακρόκοπτον πλατύ* and *πλατύτομον* (*Meph.* i. 60, 62); *στρόβιλος μακρός* (*Hippo.* ii. 258); *μικρὸς ἀβάκινος* (*Hippo.* i. 388); *κρατίκων* and *κόβιν μακρόκοπτον* (*Hippo.* ii. 703); *πρόκοπτον μικρόκοπτον* (Galen ii. 682) *ἀναγκαστικὸν μακρόκοπτον* (Galen ii. 683).

ἐπιτίθεται τὸ κλιβανοῦν ἔχον μικροῦ δεῖν τὸν τοῦ κλιβανοῦ τύπον ἐμμελῶς τε καὶ κατὰ τὸν κρίκον ἐπιβάλλον τὸν τοῦ κλιβανοῦ κρίκον (*Meph.* ii 8 *passim*) *καὶ πνεύματα, ξύλινα, κρυστὰ, ἀμφὶ, ἐξίστασθαι*, quoted by Wetstein.

This seems to be the only place where *ἁρμὸς* is applied to the human body, and its precise meaning in this application may be learned from the medical writers *passim*.

Galen defines two kinds of junction of the bones in the human body, as (1) *ἀκίνητοι*, immovable; (2) *ἀμφίκινοι*, mixed motion without motion, *κατὰ δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην σύμφυσιν ἐν ἑκάτῳ τῶν κατὰ ἁρθρον καὶ κατὰ ἁρμόνιον. ἁρθρον δὲ τὸν ἀπὸ κότου κατὰ ἀστρον κινούμενον ἁρμὸν δ' ἐστὶν ἀστρον ἀνεμπόδιστον κινοῦν ἀστρον ἀνεμπόδιστον*, Galen xix, 400.

He again (ii. 734) describes the junction of bones as *κατὰ ἁρθρον*, articulation, and *κατὰ σύμφυσιν*, is growing together, so that two bones form one continuous substance. *ἐστι δὲ ἡ σύμφυσις τῶν ἀστεοῦν*

[1] Of medical phrases he notes only *σωφρὼν* (v. 11; vi. 12); *ἀφίκοιτο* and *πίοιτο* (in the cit. *Hippo.* xiii. Latini, i. 622; iv. 360). He also observes that *ἀγέρων* (St. Luke i. 7, Hippocrates might have added Acts iv. 29; xxv. 13) was a favourite word of Greek medical writers. DRUITSEUS, *Comm. on Ep. to Hebrews*, E. T. ii. 400.

αὐτὰς ἅπτει κατὰ γένος, ἃ μὲν ἕνεκα κατὰ ἥβην ἃ δὲ ἕνεκα κατὰ σύμφυτον—τὰ μὲν οὖν ἄρθρα ἐστὶ σύνταξις ἀστῶν φυτῶν. ἢ δὲ σύμφυτος ἔστιν ἀστῶν φυτῶν.

This *ἄρθρον* and *σύμφυτον* were convertible terms for the cohesion—common (*koinon*) of two limes as opposed to *ἄρθρον*, articulation.

The earlier anatomists, as Hippocrates, reckoned many of the bones under *ἀρθρά* or *σύμφυτα*, which Galen corrects and places under *ἄρθρα* (*Comment. Hipp. de Articulis*, xviii. 460). Modern anatomists place bones among some of their subdivisions of articulation, still however retaining the term synophysis, e.g. synophysis of the lower jaw, of the sacrum, of the sternum to the ribs, which, when joining instruction for the sciences of the two bones of which it is composed, allows no motion to ascertain (*Gray*, p. 57). Cf. *Gray*, p. 58 (sternum) along the ribs with a strong, yet supple hold. Θοῦκα κ.τ.λ. Θοῦκα (*Thuca*) is a reading of Ms. Vat. 1. Θοῦκα ἀστῶν φυτῶν ἀστῶν ἄρθρα ἐστὶ σύνταξις τῶν ἀστῶν φυτῶν ἀστῶν φυτῶν ἄρθρα τῶν ἀστῶν φυτῶν τὰς ἄρθρα τῶν ἀστῶν φυτῶν τὰς ἄρθρα τῶν ἀστῶν φυτῶν τὰς

proper channel, in the act of swallowing, and getting into a wrong *χίνα*, *ἐ.ᾳ.* *διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ἄρχομαι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἔνθα ἄλλοι τὴν τελευτὴν ποιοῦνται, ἵνα μὴ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν τροφὴν καὶ τὴν τοῦ πνεύματος κίνησιν ἀνοιγομένου βίᾳ τοῦ κλείθρου ἄμα ἀλλήλαις ἐνεργεῖν τε καὶ κωλύειν καὶ ἀνεμποδίστως ἀλλήλαις χρῆσθαι καὶ βίᾳ τὴν ἀναπνοὴν ἐνίστασθαι.* *Galen* ii. 300. See also iii. 590; v. 719; xii. 899. Similarly of blood and other secretions, iii. 491; ii. 95; xii. 282; iv. 624.

iii. 1, *ἔρευν* is used by the medical writers for an enlargement of the body or some part of it, *e.g.* of a tumour, Aretæus 107, 110, 127; of tonsils, *Galen* ii. 73, 74; of the bones, 158; of inflammation, 160, 161; of the liver and spleen, 164; of the lungs, 168, 197, 207, 451, 516, 532, 805, 6c. Galen mentions this *ἔρευν* as a common result of inflammation adhesion and the bones, 160, 161, *ἔρευν τὴν ἐν τοῖς ὀστοῖς γινομένην ἀπὸ τῆς φλεγμονῆς ἔρευν ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐκεῖνο τὸ μόριον ἐπιφύεσθαι τῷ ἀρρωστοῦντι μορίῳ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τοῦ ἑτέρου ἀρρωστοῦντος τὴν ἀναπνοὴν ἔρευν κατὰ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ βράδυνσιν καὶ κατάβασιν ἐμπύου.* 160 (*ἐπ.*).

Hebrews xi. 11, *εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος.* This phrase is used in the same way by Galen, *e.g.* xiv. 8. 653 *κατὰ τὴν κοιλίαν τῶν τρίβων καὶ τὴν κατάκλισιν ἐν μὲν τῷ κύφῳ χρόνῳ εἰς καταβολὴν τοῦ σπέρματος.* Ibid. 9 *εἰς ἐν ἅπαν τὸν τῆς κύφωσεως χρόνον καταβολὴν εἰς τὸν μόριον τοῦ θήλεως,* and iv. 168, xv. 74, etc.

Hebrews v. 11, 12, *νωθροί* is much used by Hippocrates, *e.g.* *νωθρὸν σκόβαλον,* i. 52. See i. 172, 174, 176, 178, 180, 346, 6c.; he also uses *νωθρότης,* 159, 162, 166, 6c.; *νωθρὸν* 170; *νωθρῶς* and *νωθρύνω* 6c.

Hebrews vi. 1, 2. The writer quoting Joel ii. 28 uses *ἐκχεῶ* for *ἐκχεῶ* in the LXX. Similarly *ἐκχεῶ* occurs in the LXX. Similarly St. Luke (*Acts* xv. 16), when quoting Amos ix. 11, uses *ἀνοικοδομῶ* which is not in LXX. St. Luke uses it again (St. Luke xiii. 13) in relating the healing of the woman who had been bowed down by infirmity: to describe "her being made straight," *ἀνορθοῦν* and *ἀνόρθωσις* are constantly used by Hippocrates for straightening, and natural position abnormal or dislocated parts of the body.

Other words peculiar to St. Luke and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which were much employed by the medical writers, are *ἀκολουθέω,* Hebrews ii. 15, St. Luke xxi. 38, *ἀστεῖος,* St. Luke xx. 39, *ἀναβολή,* Hebrews xi. 15, St. Luke v. 18.

παρέκβασις, Hebrews xii. 13, St. Luke xi. 18, 19, *ἀκτίν,* St. Luke v. 36, 37; *παρήορμαι,* Hebrews v. 24, Acts xv. 39.

B

The *medical* evangelist was also a *psychologist.* The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has also the same characteristic.

(a)

As regards human thought and character, the whole objective domain.

E.g. the power of the *nous*[1] in grasping the whole of human nature. (Hebrews iv. 2 = personal apprehension of it: φυχῆς καὶ νοήματος . ἐνθυμήσεις καὶ ἔννοιαι καρδίας (ver. 12): psychology of the spiritual and of a fallen[2] condition (vi. 4, 5, 6): long series of psychological sketches, Hebrews xi. (Esau in xii. 16, 17): the remarkable ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ τῆς καρδίας[1] (Hebrews xii. 4).

As regards the character and mission of our Lord.

The Epistle to the Hebrews enlarges on another line. Luke ii. 52. The peculiar temptation of suffering and sorrow (recognized by Jesus Himself, St. Luke xxii. 28, ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου: Hebrews ii. 18: Acts xx. 19, Hebrews iv. 15): insting in increased *experimental* knowledge (ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν, ver. 8): the exquisite balance and adjustment of character (μετριοπαθεῖν, Hebrews v. 2): the pathos of the third evangelist, in his Gospel the weeping pathos (St. Luke xxiii. 46-48), in his Epistle the weeping theologian (Hebrews v. 7). Truly is the *pathetic* Christ (ὁ πάσχων ὁ Χ., Acts xxvi. 23) the same in the Gospel and Acts as in Hebrews; He of whom suffering is so often predicated (St. Luke ix. 22: xvii. 25: xxii. 15: xxiv. 26: Acts i. 3: iii. 18: xvii. 3: Hebrews ii. 18: v. 8: ix. 26: xiii. 12).

Once more a conception, absolutely *unique* in the New Testament, of the function of suffering in *perfecting* our High Priest is given to us by Himself in the third Gospel only. [τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι. St. Luke xiii. 32.] As applied to man—his works, his times, his ways, his qualities—to God's work, derivers, word, it is common enough (*e.g.* St. John iv. 34: Philippians iii. 12: St. James ii. 22: 1 St. John ii. 8): but as applied to Christ Himself and His char-

[1] A constant subject of thought to St. *Luke*. Acts v. 1-11: viii. 18-24.

[2] No doubt based on Numbers xv. 38, but involving a profound view of human nature.

sciat nemo, except St. Luke xiii. 33 and Hebrews ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 28. In these passages it means not supply and correction (which underlies *sanctus*, Hebrews xii. 21), but to make commemorate according to its nature; to fill in with its appointed course; to ennoble to the utmost. (Cf. Hebrews ii. 10, *cf.* "without suffering is no man ennobled." ROTHE, *Stille Stunden.*)

III

We briefly advert to resemblances in Christological conceptions and general views of Christian and ecclesiastical life.

A

Christological Conceptions.

It has been observed by one of the most earnest and capable of all modern students of the New Testament that there are two great words perpetually recurring in the Acts, *ἀίρειν* and *ὑψοῦν*.[1]

These words do not occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews with at all the same frequency. But their importance is not to be measured by the childish test of counting numbers, but by their emphasis and vitality.

The story of St. Luke's Gospel hastens on to the *Ascension*,[2]

[1] BISHOP WORDSWORTH. *Introduction to Acts*, pp. 4, 5.

"The Ascension, the pinnacle of St. Luke's Gospel history, is at the same time the point of departure for the history of the Acts. On one side we *go up* to this summit; on the other we *go down* from it. Hence the two narratives of this fact. In truth it belongs to both writings—to one as its crown, to the other as its base. The Ascension is the link which connects the two phases of the divine works—that in which Jesus raises Himself from the cradle to the Throne; that in which, from the height of His Throne, He acts upon humanity, creating, sustaining, extending His Church. The Ascension makes an integral part of both one and other." (*Commentaire sur l'Evangile S. Luc.* Godet, Tom. ii. pp. 476, 477.) These sentences, written by one who at the time was not thinking of our Epistle, well bring out the unity of the entire Lucan group.

ὃν τῷ συμπαραλαβεῖν τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ (St. Luke iv. 51). The Ascension closes the first narrative of the third evangelist, and begins the second. Jesus ascended, Jesus in heaven, is the leading Christological conception of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (ἀφικομένου μᾶλλον ἢ κεκινδυνευκότος, *πλωτοῦ*, "passed through the heavens." Hebrews iv. 4. *Cf.* vii. 26; ix. 24.) Jesus as our Divine Lord completes the Christological conception. (Note the order of the words in the glorious benediction: *τὸν θεὸν τῆς εἰρήνης* = "Our Lord—Jesus." Hebrews xiii. 21.)[1]

B

Ecclesiastical and Christian Life.

i. Christians in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in St. Luke's writings are ἀγιαζόμενοι. The ἁγιαζ. are those who, by continuing acts of faith, are making the work of Christ individually their own. *Cf.* Hebrews ii. 11; x. 10-14 with Acts xx, 32; xxvi. 18.

2. The theological treatise points back to the ecclesiastical history.[2] It would render the actual Church-life complete by Confirmation as the consummation of Baptism. The actual Church-life began with this. (Acts viii. 14-17; xix. 2.) The ideal Church-life must never part with it. (Hebrews vi. 2.) The Eucharist is in the one as in the other; dim and veiled at first in the Epistle, more opening at the close. (Acts ii. 42-46; xx. 7. Hebrews vi. 5; x. 22, 25; xiii. 10.)

(a) The Gospel *leads up* to the *fact* of the Ascension. (b) The Acts *leads down* to its *historical effect*. (c) The Epistle to Hebrews leads up again to its *theology*.

[1] Let the young student read again and again these few pages which so man but the Bishop of Durham could have written. *The Divine Nexus in the Epistle. Epistle to the Hebrews.* WESTCOTT. Pp. 32-35.

[2] In a different way Hebrews x. 32, 34 may well represent in a summary form Acts iv. 32; iv. 18; v. 18; viii. 1; xi. 19; xii. 25; xiii. 27.

3. We have seen that the writer of the third Gospel and of the Acts is *angel-haunted*. So is the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In chapters i., ii. we have the angelology of the Psalms; while (like St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians)[1] he keeps the angels in their place. "(i. 4, 13, 14.) He notices that "the law was spoken by angels." (Hebrews ii. 2.) The glory of the company into which we are brought is enhanced by the full frequence, the great enormity of the racism of the angels. (ἀμέτρῳ ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει, "ἀγάπῃ, ἀναγωγαῖς of angels." Hebrews xii. 22, 23.) The expressive hints of St. Luke (xv. 5-10; xvi. 22) are crowned by the fuller information which shows us the hierarchy of angelic spirits doing service for us." (Cf. also Hebrews xiii. 2.)

4. The high endowment of a sense of beauty is evidently the heritage of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the author of the Gospel. Hence vivid and expressive images (iv. 2; v. 7, 19, the anchor, a word so natural for a storm-beaten evangelist; ix 7 "holding the ambight scenes at distance hail" ἀμφιβόλοις ἀναπέμπουσι, xi. 13; the cloud, the amphitheatre, the little discipline of every child's life (xii. 1, 8, 9, 5, 12) sometimes a whole beautiful and tender picture in a single word (ἐν τῷ ὤτι ἕως ἄρτι, xii. 20. Our "way" is not a *ὁδός* pavement trodden by the foot of a single person at long intervals; but a way "living," because one with the living Person of Christ.

In his higher passages we find the equipoise of intellect and emotion: an enthusiasm beyond artificial rhetoric, which never loses itself in the sanic mists of poetry, nor evaporate in sounding words.[2]

[1] Has the hint of the *ἄπνοα* orders or aspects of the earthly ministry being transfigured and embodied in the angels ever been noticed? Λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα εἰς διακονίαν, v. 7.—(Hebrews i. 14)—priestlood, diaconate, apostolate. Perhaps this may be likely to modify some words of Bishop Westcott. *Epistle to Hebrews*. P. 54. ("No one of the words which have come to represent the main ideas of Church government is used in it with the limited technical sense.")

[2] *Study* Hebrews xii. 22, 25. In xiii. 20, 21, a careful analysis

On the whole, then, we think that the case may fairly be presented as follows:—

(1) There is quite a flight of *moral, expressions,* and *constructions* in the Epistle to the Hebrews, commonly (not seldom exclusively) used by St. Luke. After all deductions for a common source in the LXX., or in the current Greek of the Church and of society in that age, the evidence is, to say the least, remarkable. (ii.) There are in the Epistle to the Hebrews various traces of the results of a *medical training,* and of *psychological power,* whether in *analysis* of modes of thought and feeling, or in *delineations of character.* These indications also point in the direction of St. Luke. (iii.) To the we may add—(A) Common Christological conceptions, notably of the *ascended Christ in heaven.* (B) Common notes of ecclesiastical and spiritual life. (i) The Christian life one of continuing sanctification. (ii) A life characterized by Confirmation as the *complement* of Baptism, and by participation in the Holy Eucharist. (3) One in which the angels have a part, and to which (in the extreme subordination as of the finite to the infinite, but the remote to the Uncreated) they afford certain glooms of help and beauty.

To us it seems that, while no demonstration is unattainable, the advance of critical study points to some modification of the view advanced by Clement of Alexandria and Origen,[1]

will show at least few great dogmatic or spiritual conceptions in what to a superficial reader may seem but a burst of pious enthusiasm.

[1] It may well be advised to some little modesty therein seen in Delitzsch. (a) The ancient canonical position of the Epistle to the Hebrews is immediately after the Epistle to Philemon. By this arrangement, the very last words before the benediction in Philemon are Μάρκος, Ἀριστοβουλος, Δημᾶς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συνεργοί μου (ver. 24). This immediate *local juxtaposition* of Luke with the Epistle to the Hebrews may have been intended to hint at a more vital, and not merely literalness, connection between the evangelist and the Epistle. (b) The alliteration of the opening words of the Epistle (ΠΟΛΥΜΕΡΩΣ καὶ ΠΟΛΥΤΡΟΠΩΣ) in the case of the Apostle who exercised some remarkable function in regard to it (Πολλοὶ κατὰ) Delitzsch, to be much more than accidental. No doubt the practice of "hinted

ADDITIONAL NOTE B (p. 147).

Cardinal Newman's delineation of the effect of a first reading of St. Luke's Gospel upon a Greek mind.

THE beauty of St. Luke's Gospel, and its peculiar significance for a Greek mind, has been exhibited with singular grace and tenderness by Cardinal Newman. The Gospel which Cecilius hands to the Greek girl, Cecilia, is the Gospel of St. Luke.

"She received to the parchment and to the Bishop's words, 'here you will see Who it is that we love,' or words to that effect. She opened it at length and read. It was the writing of a provincial Greek; elegant, however, and marked with that simplicity which was to her taste the elementary idea of a classic author. It was addressed to one Theophilus, and professed to be a carefully digested and verified account of events which had already been anticipated by others. She read a few paragraphs, and became interested, and in no long time she was absorbed in the volume. When she had once taken it up, she did not lay it down. It opened a view of a new state and community of things, which only seemed too beautiful to be possible. But not into a new scene of things alone, but into the names" was in use at the time. [If this idea is to be adopted, see the *NT* in the two words without a hint of a second name?] (5) The Epistle to the Hebrews points at some special connection of the writer with *Timothy*. (Hebrews xiii. 23.) Now in the Acts of the Apostles, the first one of the Gospel pair, already St. Luke associates himself personally with the narrative, occurs in Acts xvi. 10, [*εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ κ.τ.λ.*] But this passage is immediately preceded by the history of Timothy's first connection with St. Paul. [*διὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπιλαβόμενος Τιμόθεον κ.τ.λ.* Acts xvi. 1-3.] We certainly infer some special tie between Timothy and St. Luke; and this yet another link is supplied in the long chain of considerations which lead us up to the Lucanian authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

presence of One who was simply distinct and removed from anything that she had, in her most imaginative moments, ever depicted to her mind as ideal perfection. Here was that to which her intellect tended, though that intellect could not frame it. It could approve and acknowledge when set before it what it could not originate. Here was He who spoke to her in her conscience; whose voice she heard, whose Person she was seeking for. That Image sank deep into her—she felt it to be a reality. She said to herself, 'This is no poet's dream; it is the definition of a real individual. There is too much truth, and nature, and life, and exactness about it for anything else.' Yet she shrank from it; it made her feel her own difference from it, and a feeling of humiliation came upon her mind, such as she never felt before. She began to despise herself more thoroughly: yet she recollected various passages in the history which reassured her amid her self-abasement, especially that of His tears and love for the poor girl at the feast, who would anoint His feet; and the full tears stood in her eyes, and she fancied she was that sinful child, and that He did not repel her. . . . The volume taught . . . that ever-present happiness and greatness lie in relinquishing what at first sight seemed to promise them: that the way to power is weakness, the way to success failure, the way to wisdom foolishness, the way to glory dishonour. She saw that there was a higher beauty than that which the order of the natural world revealed, and a deeper peace and calm than that which the sunshine, whether of the intellect or of the purest human affection, can supply. She now began to understand that strange, unearthly composure which had struck her in Chione, Apollina, and Cecilia. Life and death, action and suffering, fortunes and abilities, all had now a new meaning and application. As the skies speak differently to the philosopher and to the peasant, as a book of poems to the imaginative and the cold and narrow intellect, so now she saw her being, her history, her possessions, her future, in a new light, which no one else could share with her. But the rolling over of those thoughts of the whole was He who exemplified all this wonderful history in herself."

. . . "She slept sound; she dreamed—she thought she was no

longer in Africa, but in her own Greece, more sunny and bright than before; but the inhabitants were gone. Its majestic mountains, its rich plains, its expanse of waters, all alike, gave no entrance with, no one to sympathize with. And, as she wandered on and wofully, suddenly its face changed, and its colours were illuminated tenfold by a heavenly glory, and each hue upon the scene was of a beauty she had never known, and seemed strangely to affect all her senses, to feel like fragrance and music, as well as light. And there came out of the grottos and glens and woods, and out of the seas, myriads of bright images, whose forms she could not discern; and they sang and sounded, and became a sort of music, or landscape, which she could not have described in words, as if it were a world of spirits, not of matter. And, as she gazed, she thought she saw the Saviour, only glorified, for who had been alone, now arrayed more brilliantly than an oriental queen. . . . As she looked more earnestly the face changed. . . . It had an innocence in its look, and also a tenderness, which bespoke both Child and Mother. . . . And when she had come close to the gracious figure, there was a fresh change. The face, the features were the same; but the light of Divinity now seemed to beam through them, and the hair parted, and hung down long on each side of the forehead; and here also was a glory of another kind from the light I would about it, made of what looked like thorns. And the palms of the hands were spread out as if towards her, and there were marks of nails in them. And the sustenance had fallen, and there was a deep opening in the side. And as she stood entranced before Him, and motionless, she felt a consciousness that her own palms were pierced like His, and her feet also. And she looked round and saw the likeness of His face and of His wounds upon all that company. And now they were suddenly moving on, and bearing something, or some one, heavenwards; and they, too, begin to sing, and their words seemed to be, 'Rejoice with Me, for I have found My sheep.' They were up through an avenue, or long grotto, with torches of diamonds, and amethysts and sapphires, and they lit up spaces, and made them sparkle. And she tried to look, but could not discover what they were carrying, till she heard a very piercing

cry which awoke her."—*Callista: a Sketch of the Third Century.* By John Henry Newman. Pp. 202–285, 287–310, 312. These passages seem to us to convey, with subtle tact and beauty, precisely the impression which a cultivated Greek mind—first brought in contact with St. Luke's Gospel, and with few other opportunities of learning about Christ—might be supposed to form, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The appearance of the Blessed Virgin (whatever may have been behind in the gifted author's own mind) is kept within limits; and is certainly more in accordance with the guidance of St. Luke than of the modern Collyridians of France and Italy. The exquisite close of the passage leads the soul from Mary to Jesus.[1]

[1] The restless development of modern Roman Mariolatry is well illustrated in the following passage by a justly celebrated French novelist:—"She raised her eyes to the image of the Blessed Virgin and hardly knew it. The shape that stood formerly in the same spot on the same pedestal held a child in her arms. It had been replaced by another—of one who seemed to forget that she had conceived in her womb, and given a God to man. Crowned with stars, clothed with an azure mantle and a white robe embroidered in gold, this shape seemed set upon displaying her own proper distinct divinity to the universe."—"Notre et Rouges." Victor Cherbuliez. *Revue des Deux Mondes.* (Tom. xiii. 768, Per. III. chap. xv.)

INDEX

INDEX

THE END

Richard Clay & Sons, Limited, London & Bungay.